DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 462 CE 052 180

AUTHOR	Cunningham, Phyllis, Ed.; Ohliger, John, Ed.
TITLE	Radical Thinking in Adult Education. Occasional Paper No. 1.
INSTITUTION	Syracuse Univ., N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE	Feb 89
NOTE	89p.; Papers from a course on Radical Thinking in Adult Education, Summer 1987.
AVAILABLE FROM	Syracuse University Kellogg Project, 113 Euclid Avenue, Syracuse, NY 13244-4460 ($10.25; 2 or more copies: 10 percent discount).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Activism; *Adult Education; *Change Agents; Civil Rights; *Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Research; Females; *Feminism; Revolution; Social Action; *Social Change
IDENTIFIERS	*Center for the Study of Liberal Educ for Adults MA; Freire (Paulo); Hansl (Eva vom Baur); May (Samuel Joseph); Mills (C Wright); Syracuse Univ Resources for Educators of Adults NY

ABSTRACT

These five papers represent original research on various issues important to the field of adult education that draws on Syracuse University's collection of adult education materials. "Back to the Future with C. Wright Mills and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults" (Ollie Owen) provides background on Mills, the Center, and the situation in which they interacted. "Adult Education and Feminist Theory: Radical Thinking in Adult Education" (Jane Hugo) traces Hugo's personal history of involvement in feminist thought, outlines feminist theory, and explores the problems of implementing that theory in adult education work and in the graduate study of the field. "On the Idea of an Emancipatory Pedagogy" (Brent Snow) examines feminist theory, the approaches of Freireans, and the approaches of human potential activists. "Eva vom Baur Hansl: Brain-Ideas vs. Life-Ideas" (Bernita Bowen) discusses the extensive materials in the Hansl collection that provide primary source material for anyone interested in tracing the dilemma of women in the shifting roles, ideologies, and attitudes of the 20th century. "The Just Demands of the Other: An Introduction to Samuel Joseph May" (Irene Baros-Johnson) presents the life of the 19th-century Unitarian minister who was seminally active in civil rights, women's rights, and peace. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305462

Syracuse University Kellogg Project
In Cooperation with the Center for the Study of Citizenship
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY

Occasional Paper Series

RADICAL THINKING IN ADULT EDUCATION

Papers from a course on
Radical Thinking in Adult Education
Conducted by Phyllis Cunningham and John Ohliger,
Summer, 1987

Co-Editors
Phyllis Cunningham
John Ohliger

Series Editors
Roger Hiemstra
Mary Beth Hinton

Occasional Paper No. 1

February 1989

CE052180

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M E Hinton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Copying without fee is prohibited without the written permission of the Series Editors or their designee. Abstracting or normal citing is permitted provided that credit to the source is given.

New York State residents, add 7% of the total cost for sales tax or provide your tax exempt identification number.

Multiple copies of 2 or more are eligible for a 10% reduction.

Please return the tear-off sheet below with your order. Each order must include a check or money order, prepaid in U.S. currency.

		Total
# _____ Occasional Paper No. 1 @ $10.25 each	$ _____	$_____
Less 10% quantity discount for 2 copies or more	_____	_____
N.Y.S. residents - 7% sales tax of the total for report(s)	_____	_____
Tax exempt identification number _____		
Shipping & handling:		
Single copy - $2.50	_____	_____
Multiple copies - $1.75 x #___ reports	_____	_____
Amount Enclosed		$_____

Make checks or money orders payable to SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

SHIP TO:

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE _____

COUNTRY _____

SEND ORDER TO: KELLOGG PROJECT
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
113 Euclid Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13244-4160

CONTENTS

The Authors....iv

Preface....v

Introduction....vi

Back to the Future with C. Wright Mills and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Ollie Owen....1

Adult Education and Feminist Theory: Radical Thinking in Adult Education
Jane M. Hugo....16

On the Idea of an Emancipatory Pedagogy
Brent R. Snow....37

Eva Vom Baur Hansl: Brain-Ideas Vs. Life-Ideas
Bernita A. Bowen....53

The Just Demands of the Other: An Introduction to Samuel Joseph May
Irene Baros-Johnson....63

THE AUTHORS

Ollie Owen is working towards her certificate of advanced studies in the Adult Education Program. As a research associate at the Syracuse University Kellogg Project, she is currently assigned to the project's Computers and the Elderly Program.

Jane M. Hugo is a doctoral student in the Adult Education Program and a research associate at the Syracuse University Kellogg Project.

Brent R. Snow is a doctoral student in the Adult Education Program. He was the editorial associate for the *Adult Education Quarterly* through December 1988 and is graduate assistant for the Weekend Scholar Program.

Bernita A. Bowen is working towards a master's degree in the Adult Education Program. She also teaches at Utica College.

Irene Baros-Johnson holds a master of divinity degree from Drew Theological School. She co-authored the 1988 book, May No One be a Stranger: 150 Years of Unitarian Presence in Syracuse.

PREFACE

This paper is produced by the Kellogg Project of Syracuse University in cooperation with the University's Center for the Study of Citizenship and through the support of the Adult Education Graduate Program. The Kellogg Project was funded to find new ways of bringing information and ideas from the University's vast collection of adult education materials to educators of adults throughout the world.

One means of accomplishing this end is to stimulate graduate students to think about various issues important to the field, drawing on the collection in that process. Drs. Cunningham and Ohliger's course accomplished that goal quite well. Thus, five of the best papers resulting from the course are presented in this occasional paper.

It is hoped that readers will become better acquainted with some influential people of the past, some ideas that have currency regardless of age, and some current thinking that has potential for changing the adult education field. Your comments and feedback are always welcome.

Roger Hiemstra
February 1989

113 Euclid Avenue
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244
HIEMSTRA@SUVM

INTRODUCTION

> To the extent that the adult college is effective, it is going to be political. . . Colleges for adults . . . are going to have to get into trouble. For publics that really want to know the realities of their community and nation and world are, by that determining fact, politically radical. Politics as we know it today often rests upon myths and lies and crackpot notions; and many policies, debated and undebated, assume inadequate and misleading definitions of reality. When such myth and hokum prevail, those who are out to find the truth are bound to be upsetting. . . . The role of education, especially of education for adults, is to build and sustain publics that will 'go for,' and develop, and live with, and act upon adequate definitions of reality.

That's the conclusion of a talk titled "Mass Society and Liberal Education," by C. Wright Mills, the most widely read sociologist in the world (Eldridge, 1983, p. 13). Mills' controversial speech was presented in 1954 under the sponsorship of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. The Center's archives, along with hundreds of thousands of other documents, are housed in the huge Adult and Continuing Education Research Collection at the George Arents Research Library for Special Collections in the Bird Library of Syracuse University.

In order to begin to delve into the world's largest repository of adult education materials in the English language, we conducted a seminar at Syracuse University in association with the Kellogg Project in the summer of 1987 on the theme "Radical Thinking in Adult Education." Participants burrowed into the hundreds of boxes of documents seeking original sources for research papers while reading and discussing materials we had compiled in advance, including works by these radical educators: Mills himself, Don Adams, Michael Apple, Linda Babler, David Castellanos, Hubert Dreyfus, Blanca Facundo, Michel Foucault, Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, Arlene Goldbard, Antonio Gramsci, Mike Gunderloy, Mickey Hellyer, Ivan Illich, Lao Tzu, Paul Robinow, Michael Rossman, Fred Schied, Rajesh Tandon, Raymond Williams, and Paul Willis.

The Kellogg Project generously offered to publish an occasional paper presenting the resulting research of the participants. Five participants submitted their work and this publication is the result.

Most adult educators are aware of the reviving interest in Lindeman (e.g., Stewart, 1987), but the continuing and now growing interest in C. Wright Mills, whose remarks headed this Introduction may not be so obvious. A recent best-seller cites him as a shining example of a "scrappy public thinker" sadly lacking in today's academically professionalized climate (Jacoby, 1987, p. 118). And the book published in 1963 containing the quoted talk of Mills is still in print along with several of his longer works (Horowitz, 1963). Ollie Owen in "Back to the Future with C. Wright Mills and the Center for the Study of Continuing Education for Adults" provides worthwhile background on him, the Center, and the situation in which they interacted.

Jane Hugo's paper, "Adult Education and Feminist Theory," synthesizes the ideas she has encountered in adult education and in women's studies. She traces her own personal history of involvement in feminist thought, succinctly outlines feminist theory, and explores the problems of implementing that theory in adult education work and in graduate study of the field. Throughout she points to fundamental questions raised by her study and emphasizes the personal and political tensions she--and all of us--face in working toward a world liberated from gender, race, and class domination.

Feminist theory, the approaches of Freireans, and of human potential activists form the three strands Brent Snow examines in "On the Idea of an Emancipatory Pedagogy." Like Hugo he focuses on the tough questions confronting us as we attempt to find educational assistance in moving toward a planet freed from top-down control of our lives. Snow finds that the work of Antonio Gramsci powerfully challenges the pedagogical assumptions of the feminists, Freireans, and human potential activists. In calling for a reinterpretation of these and other radical traditions, he notes some of their similarities and concludes by invoking the ever fresh spirit of Eduard Lindeman.

Radical figures like Lindeman and Mills continue to live in a public glow, and there currently is much interest in feminist issues, but the last two works in this occasional paper show that some figures neglected by history also have much to teach us.

Bernita Bowen in "Eva Vom Baur Hansl: Brain-Ideas vs. Life-Ideas" brings us the results of searching through 14 specially marked boxes in the massive collection of adult education materials at Syracuse University. Eva Vom Baur Hansl was a prophetic figure in women's adult education, active in broadcasting, journalism, and government work for 50 years from the beginning of the second decade of this century. The extensive materials in the Hansl collection, as Bowen says, provide primary-source information for anyone interested in tracing the dilemma of women in "the many shifting roles, ideologies, and attitudes of a changing twentieth century."

Finally, Irene Baros-Johnson in "The Just Demands of the Other: Samuel Joseph May" helps us to realize that educational work on civil rights, women's rights, and peace are inseparably part of the same movement for freedom and liberation. Baros-Johnson presents the life of the nineteenth century Unitarian minister, Sam May, seminally active in all three areas, as a vibrant example of what one person can do when working cooperatively but courageously with others.

We are pleased to present the work of these able, energetic students. We enjoyed going with them into the adult education archives to see and feel the boxes, and to work dialectically with them in sorting out their ideas, which aimed at going to the "root" of our learning. Their work reminds us that the original historic meaning of "radical" is "root": to "express an inherent and fundamental quality" (Williams, 1976, p. 209). And in their research we find renewed inspiration to join with others to nondogmatically reassert the personal and social necessity for vigorous and fundamental--certainly radical--transformation.

Phyllis Cunningham and John Ohliger

REFERENCES

Eldridge, J. (1983). *C. Wright Mills.* New York: Methuen.

Horowitz, I. (1963). *Power, politics & people: The collected essays of C. Wright Mills.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Jacoby, R. (1987). *The last intellectuals: American culture in the age of academe.* New York: Basic Books.

Stewart, D. (1987). *Adult learning in America: Eduard Lindeman and his agenda for lifelong education.* Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing.

Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society.* New York: Oxford University Press.

BACK TO THE FUTURE WITH C. WRIGHT MILLS AND THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

Ollie Owen

Introduction

The Syracuse University Resources for Educators of Adults (SUREA), the world's largest repository of English language materials in the adult education field, contains personal and organizational records of historical importance to the field of adult education. One published and controversial essay within this collection, Mass Society and Liberal Education, written by C. Wright Mills, was presented at a Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (CSLEA)[1] conference. This paper describes some aspects of the CSLEA, its history and its mission, tracks information on Mill's meeting with the organization, and provides some background on Mills.

CSLEA

According to James Whipple (1967) who wrote the history of CSLEA, the two characteristics that distinguished CSLEA from other organizations were its concerns for higher education for adults and its quasi-independence. The Center was established because a group of deans from the Association of Evening Colleges believed evening colleges needed help in developing more effective programs of liberal education. Originally proposed as a specific project, it soon became apparent that here existed a continuing task: "For although practically everyone in American Society favors liberal education, few do anything about it" (1967, p. III).

Whipple explains that CSLEA operated from a quasi-independent position, working outside but for universities. Thus, although CSLEA was an independent organization, it was also dependent on universities.

An excerpt from a letter written to a colleague from Whipple is informative:

> I have been trying to conquer new fields since I wrote to you. After a year as an assistant to the Dean's Office at Western Reserve College, I came to Chicago last fall to work as a Research Associate at the Center (CSLEA). Our preoccupation, is with university adult education, and at University Evening Colleges. We are a child of the Fund for Adult Education which is a child of the Ford Foundation. The work is challenging in an area which is in great flux. At

> times it is also discouraging from the point of view of liberal education which is our mandate. (March 24, 1954b)

The CSLEA materials in the Syracuse collection cover the years of operation between 1951-1968. The 1969 materials consist exclusively of correspondence dealing with the termination of the Center. The collection has 84 boxes and 19 packages totaling 45 linear feet. In 1977, Charters compiled *Adult and Continuing Education Collections--A Descriptive List of Manuscripts of Holdings in Syracuse University,* at the George C. Arents Research Library for Special Collections located on the sixth floor of Syracuse University's Bird Library. Charters' publication can be used as a resource tool for research on the organization. The compilation includes a description of the CSLEA, a background sketch, and lists of information contained in each of the 84 boxes.

This paper concentrates on the first phase in the life of CSLEA, the years 1951 to 1955, with a special emphasis on 1954. This was the year that C. Wright Mills, the radical sociologist, was invited to present a paper, "Mass Society and Liberal Education," at the CSLEA National Conference on the Urban University and Community in New Orleans.

The director and staff of CSLEA were quite pleased that Mills was going to present a major essay, as noted in the following memorandum:

> Here are the last minute additions to the materials we sent you. They include memos from Ron Lippett and Floyd Hunter, a corrected list of conference members, and a detailed program. We are happy to announce that C. Wright Mills, of Columbia University, has accepted the invitation to deliver a paper for the conference. (Whipple, March, 1954a)

Whipple's history of CSLEA is, for the most part, a history without people. That is, it is a history without people named because people act between and behind every line. (The impersonality was no doubt dictated by the still-limited perspective.) They were too close for making historical judgements on actions of persons who were still alive and active in the field (1967, p. IV).

This paper breaks with Whipple's 1967 history and concentrates on C. Wright Mills, the Conference's reaction to his paper, and the interplay between Mills and other Conference participants.

Mills is connected with the Center in its first phase when there were hours upon hours spent on the determination of an adequate description of liberal education by Center staff. But a classical definition and description remained:

> Liberal education is designed to force the mind to develop mental capacities, to excite the imaginative powers and, thus, it is not an informational program; and that liberal education is not to be confused with vocational training. People have to earn a living, but liberal education is not supposed to teach them how. Liberal education should, however, make the student better equipped to solve both theoretical and practical problems, and thus make him more capable of living a good and creative life. (Whipple, 1967, p.8)

The debate on the correct definition of liberal education continued up to the New Orleans conference and combined it with another Center task, debate on the community. According to the original plans, the Center was to increase its understanding of the community in order to help evening colleges with promotional problems. Whipple reported that an even more important obligation was to understand the nature of urban and suburban society in order to help universities deal with this most crucial educational issue facing American society (1967, p. 22).

However, in 1954 there was a noticeable shift to a new direction when the Center ran a seminar at New Orleans which attempted to define methods for the study of the urban community. Thus, the stage was set for the meeting between C. Wright Mills and the Center.

C. WRIGHT MILLS

Who was C. Wright Mills? What had he accomplished in 1954 to be invited to participate in a conference which was intended to change the direction of the Center? Mills was a sociologist who in 45 brief years produced a body of work that critically analyzed American class structure and called for a radical sociology in place of "grand theorizing." His trilogy, *The New Men of Power, White Collar, and The Power Elite* was two-thirds completed in 1954. Mills refers to his work in progress (*The Power Elite*) in the Center Conference's fourth session where there was discussion on structures of power and education:

> Let me mention in passing that I have been doing a study of elites in America. I have taken the top Admirals and Generals, the business managers who do not own the property they manage, but nevertheless are quite well off. I use as a rough criterion people who own thirty million or more. I am also including about 150 top politicians, starting out from the Cabinet, the very top; certain celebrity figures; the international set, key diplomats, and so on. (Miller, 1954, p. 122)

Thus, between the years 1946 and 1956, Mills helped define the composition of America's class structure.

Mills became a prophet and at the end of his life was even considered something of a fanatic. Irving Louis Horowitz, considered a prominent authority on Mills, describes him this way:

> His celebrations became absorbed with the truth or falsity of his prophesies, while his detractors developed strong antipathies for his fanaticisms. Mills remains an engrossing figure for the social sciences and for American letters less because of any uniquely inspiring concept or well turned pithy phrase than because of his persistent belief that the qualities of intensity, purpose, and judgement must be brought front and center into that discourse of social research . . . If we look back at the great utopians of the past we find them uniformly breaking empirical barriers to create, in their minds' eye at least, a better future. That America was Mills' essential laboratory for testing, teascial [sic] meaning and thundering was an accident of birth, but one which gave special meaning and a cutting edge, at best, a blunt one, to his search for the Fourth Epoch--the utopian longing within all idealogists [sic] and, I dare say, all sociologists. (1983, p. 330)

Mills was born in Waco, Texas, on August 28, 1916. He died in Nyack, New York, on March 20, 1962. He knew when he was twenty-five that he had a heart condition. Mills graduated from the University of Texas on June 5, 1939, receiving both the baccalaureate and master's degrees. He was accepted at the University of Wisconsin's doctoral program, receiving a teaching assistantship. At Wisconsin, Mills wrote a book on social psychology with Hans Gerth entitled, *Character and Social Structure* (1953). Mills spent two years at the University, leaving for the University of Maryland in 1941. Mills spent each of his summers from 1942 to 1943 in New York

City. This lead to a position in the Bureau of Applied Social Research in 1945 at Columbia University. Mills left the Bureau in 1948 to become an associate professor at Columbia. Mills never left Columbia. He liked working and living in New York City; to him New York remained the American Mecca. This transplanted Texan only returned to Texas to deliver an occasional paper. He always came back to his home in Morningside Heights.

The intellectual influences on Mill's development as a thinker, up to 1954, included Karl Mannheim, William James, John Dewey, and Max Weber.

THE UNITED STATES IN 1954

A description of the political climate in the country during 1954 is a necessary prologue to the New Orleans Conference. Dwight David Eisenhower, a Republican, was elected president in 1952 after twenty years of Democratic Party rule. Selected to be his vice-president was Senator Richard Nixon of California, who had won recognition as a fighter against alleged communist infiltration in government. The Eisenhower Cabinet was industrially and commercially oriented. More than half the appointees were businessmen; all except one were millionaires. Chosen secretary of state, John Foster Dulles was given more control over American foreign affairs than had been exercised by any previous secretary of state. Eisenhower named Charles Erwin Wilson, President of General Motors, as secretary of defense; Wilson is remembered by his slogan, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country."

The new Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the head of which was given cabinet status, was established in 1953 and was dealing with the health, education, social, and economic welfare of the American people in 1954.

Congress also amended the Social Security Act in 1954 to provide coverage to new occupational groups, including farmers and state and local government employees, and to increase the amount of pensions to retirees.

There were many politicians who exploited the deep anti-communist feeling in the nation, but according to Krout and Rice (1977), no one did so with such vehemence and initial success as Republican Senator Joseph N. McCarthy of Wisconsin. Such activities entered his name in the English language and the term McCarthyism soon came to denote the making of indiscriminate and often unsubstantiated charges of subversive activities. McCarthy achieved national prominence when he charged in a speech delivered in West Virginia in 1950 that he had, and waved it in front of his

audience, a list of card-carrying communists in the State Department. However, he never showed anyone the list.

From 1950 to 1954 he alleged that a number of government agencies were infiltrated by communists, "pinkos," and security risks. Anyone who took issue with him or his assistants, Cohen and Schine, were characterized as disloyal or obtuse. He had the authority to charge with treasonable conduct such persons as General George C. Marshall and Secretary of State Dean Acheson. President Eisenhower would not confront him until he began investigating the Army Signal Corps in 1954. During April through June of that year, televised hearings were held on two sets of charges. In many confrontations with army counsel, Joseph B. Welch, and through television commentator Edward R. Murrow's exposure, McCarthy's "bullying methods" were revealed to an estimated 20 million American viewers. His reputation was severely damaged, and in December of 1954 he was censored by his own peers. The Senate, by a vote of 67 to 22, condemned his conduct as unbecoming a member of the United States Senate.

However, during McCarthy's four-year reign of terror, Americans turned against Americans. Those who were labeled "pinkos" or "reds" were often without meaningful employment and many were reduced to poverty. This was not a climate for radicals. According to Horowitz (1983), ex-radicals were busily naming names and recanting former associations. The American population was in a conservative mood in the decade which began with McCarthy's crusade to identify social and political criticism with treason against the government (pp. 228-229).

MILLS AND THE CENTER CONFERENCE

During the height of the McCarthy-Army television hearings, the Center's Conference began and Mills went to New Orleans. The designated problem of the Conference was to help clarify what is meant by the often-used term "community needs." Several theoretical and research analyses were discussed. The Conference was planned to involve people who are "theory-builders" more than "head counters." It also was planned to be an experiment, with the idea that for educational administrators it is just as important to have ways of looking at facts as it is to have the facts themselves.

Mills' presentation was one conceptualized as a theory builder. Mills was very active; he presented his essay and, of course, reacted to the discussion and comments of his colleagues.

He also reacted to Dr. Floyd Hunter's presentation, "Structures of Power and Education." He then continued on to be active in the last session, "Where Do We Go From Here," which also included discussion and comments.

Members of the panel that critiqued Mills' essay were as follows: (a) Catherine Bauer, Lecturer in Planning and Housing, University of California at Berkeley; (b) Lawrence L. Frank, New York City; (c) Martin Leob, Executive Director, Kansas City Study of Middle Age and Aging; and (d) John Osman, Manager, Eastern Region, Fund for Adult Education.

Mills' essay is concerned with the transformation of a community of publics into a mass society. Mills believed that mass society produced metropolitan centers, out of which spread forces that destroy or minimize the classic liberal public. Mills clarified the differences between public and mass society: "In a public, virtually as many people express opinions as receive them at the opposite extreme; in a mass, far fewer people express opinions than receive them (1963, p.355)."

Within Mills' theory of the public and mass is how they may be readily distinguished by their dominant modes of communications. In a community of publics, discussion is the ascendant mode of communication. The mass media, if they exist, simply enlarge and animate discussions, linking one primary public with the discussions of another. According to Mills, in a mass society the dominant type of communication is by the formal media and the publics become media markets (1963, p.355).

In his essay, Mills reviews the status of opinion, publics, milieux, and how publics transcend them all through class, status, and occupational structure. In other words, a modern society produces a mass society. The new middle class in the top levels of the nation or the city voluntarily run various enterprises and push various interests. The underlying population, identifying themselves with these top people, believe these enterprises to be in their interest also, and indeed accept the identification of these interests with the welfare of the nation or the city as a whole (1963, p.364). Mills ends with the following observation:

> The political structure of a democratic state assumes the public, and in its rhetoric asserts that this public is the very seat of sovereignty. But given all those forces that have centralized and enlarged and made less political and more administrations [sic]. The American political life, given all the metropolitan segregation that is no community, given the transformation of the old middle class into something which perhaps should not be called middle class, and given all the mass communications that do not truly communicate, what is

> happening is the decline of a set of publics that is sovereign, except in the most formal and in the most rhetorical sense. And, moreover, the remnants of such publics as remain in the interstices of the mass society are now being frightened out of existence. (p.367)

Mills concludes his essay by discussing in sections IV, V, VI, and VII, liberal education, liberal colleges for adults, and evening colleges located in metropolitan areas.

THE MESSAGE FOR ADULT EDUCATORS

Mills believed that adult educators must begin with what concerns the student most deeply. He believed this should involve proceeding in a way and with such materials as to enable adult educators to gain increasingly national insight into these concerns. He felt that the end result should be people who can and will by themselves continue learning. The end product of the liberal education is simply the self-cultivating man and woman.

Mills also recommended the use of much small-group discussion, although he made it clear that it should not be just discussion for its own sake. He also believed that teachers should have some of the skills of a group therapist. Mills' theory was that people in masses have trouble, although they are not always aware of their true meaning and source. If people in public can confront issues, they become aware of their terms. It is the task of the liberal institution, and of the liberally educated person, continually to translate troubles into issues and issues into terms of meaning for the individual (1963, p.370).

Mills proposed that informal leaders who are willing to stand up and be counted, and who, while standing up, can say something that is listened to, are necessary stimulants for communities and even colleges for adults to come together. When informal leaders are stimulated to become involved, adult colleges must subsequently have strong teachers who will stimulate and maintain genuine liberal education.

Mills ended his essay by stating that it is the role of the mind, intellect, reason, and ideas to define reality adequately, and in a publicly relevant way. The role of education, especially of education for adults, is to build and sustain publics that will "go far"; he believed this must involve developing, living with, and acting upon adequate definitions of reality (1963, p.373).

Catherine Bauer in her critique declared Mills' paper brilliant. She voiced concern with the push-pull between the newly formed suburbs and big cities. She believed society needs institutional structures in order to entertain the possibility of having publics that could conceivably deal with it (Miller, 1954, p.93).

Lawrence Frank, on the other hand, raised the question of what adult educators are doing in their educational programs that creates what he called "massifications." He believed the education system had been malfunctioning, turning out students who have not learned how to think. He agreed with Mills, that if adult education starts with the student's own aspirations, perplexities, and curiosities, a situation is created in which the valid content can exist in liberal arts courses. He raised a concern that the so-called liberal arts are not perpetuating the very ideas that make people subject to "massification" (Miller, 1954, p.98).

Mills answers both:

> When you hit a structural problem, you are just fooling around when you approach it in terms of an individual problem, or a small group milieu. You are simply, perhaps, softening the shock that the structure set up for the individual milieu. You are not confronting your problem. We live in a period when structural modifications of a revolutionary nature are needed in many areas, and yet in a time when, as I have tried to point out, there are no instrumentalities available to individuals-in-milieu to get that job done or even to approach it, or even to understand the structural outline within which and over which they might come to gain some mastery. (1954, p.95)

Loebs disagreed, stating that he often got a better discussion of political issues from people he didn't expect to react to issues than from his liberal colleagues. He suggested that academic liberals consider themselves elites. He believed city life or metropolitan life does provide escape hatches and that educational programs provide more of them (Miller, 1954, p.98).

Mills gives over a page of a heated, strong reply to Loebs' remarks. In essence, he tears apart each point made by LoebS. The critique ends with John Osman complimenting Mills for a great favor because he has struck at the heart of the concern at the conference. Osman ends by musing about the role of the urban university: "Are you willing to go into your community to begin a program of education that will bring liberating experiences, develop individuals around whom we can build these little republics?" (Miller, 1954, p.97).

A discussion on Mills' paper followed the critique panel (Miller, 1954, P.97). Robert L. Blakley, Manager of the Central Region for the Fund for Adult Education, and George E. Barton, Jr. Center staff member, were responsible for that part of the Conference.

They both believed that the group might not focus enough on the educational implications of Mills' presentation and on the critiques. Blakley began the discussion by asking Mills several questions. Beside Blakley and Barton, Phillip C. Davidson, President of the University of Louisville; William Shaw, Associate Professor of Political Science, Tulane University; John B. Schwertman, Center Director; Maxwell H. Goldberg, Executive Secretary, College English Association; Ronald Lipitt, Professor of Sociology and Psychology and Program Director, Center of Group Dynamics, University of Michigan; Herbert C. Hunsaker, Dean of the Cleveland College, Western Reserve University; and Leonard Russman, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Tulane University, raised various questions. Mills responded to the various questions and five pages of material were the result (Mills, 1954).

Blakley began by complimenting Mills on his brilliant comparisons and then questioned his various concepts. Blakley felt that the concepts Mills used were just concepts and, despite the fact they knew he was not a reactionary, his paper tended to be a kind of description of a movement from something that never existed to something that might not exist. Blakley felt an absence in Mills' presentation of some of the forces and villainy behind the dimensions he discussed.
Mills answers:

> There are decision makers, and the role of these decision makers and the limitation upon them and the checks upon them have to be studied very carefully. There are things that happen in most of these big master trends that I mentioned this morning that seems to me, in large part, to be the unintended consequences of many kinds of decisions, and that concepts can be generalized and should be generalized into a theory of history. You can't talk about education or about what you should do, or about these master trends unless you do have an explicit theory of history . . . By God, men make decisions and sometimes they have consequences for other people who have no voice in them! That's what we mean by power and there is a structure of power in this society . . .

After the exchange between Blakley and Mills, the discussants took over, with Mills being silent but listening. The very last sentence is a compliment to Mills from Professor Goldberg: "Yesterday, I felt like sending a telegram to Amherst telling them to prepare the funeral herbs, that Goldberg was coming back a corpse, but Mr. Mills has resurrected me, for which I thank him very much" (p.102).

THE AFTERMATH

Mills went on to enjoy an enormous popularity in the late 1950s and early 1960s, and his influence was widespread. One well known student activist who was influenced by Mills is Tom Hayden. Hayden, who was a leader of the new student left in the early 1960s, became editor of the University of Michigans', The Michigan Daily, then the best college newspaper in the country. An interview with Martin Luther King, whose whole implicit message was "stop writing, start acting," transformed Hayden into action. Meanwhile, he read Camus, Orwell, Dewey, and above all, Mills, about whom he wrote a thesis. According to Hertzberg, in reviewing J. Miller's book, "Democracy Is In The Streets":

> Despite the inspiration Mr. Hayden and others drew from the black struggle, the Port Huron Statement owes more to the civic republicanism of thinkers like Dewey and Mills than to the Christian pacifism of the civil rights movement. (1987, p.31)

Because Mills' paper created general interest for all educators, it was soon published by the Center in June of 1954. Some sections of the paper also were included in his book, *The Power Elite*, published in 1956. It is possible it was published immediately, because it did create conflict at the Conference:

> Dr. Mills' approach is characterized by a special dynamic [sic] by its very nature it probes into the future and challenges some of the basic assumptions of the present which lead into the future. It is not surprising, therefore, that this session exhibits more conflict than the previous ones. (Miller, 1954, p. 102A)

The CSLEA, as well as Mills, influenced the future. The organization outlived Mills by seven years. It gradually moved away from the conventional subject-centered definition of liberal education by putting "the person" as the central focus:

> No matter what approach, content, method or organization is used, the distinguishing feature of liberal education is its view of . . . [humans] as the central figure(s) in the ground of things. When liberal educators are doing what they ought to be doing, they are worrying not so much about poverty as about poor people, not about perfecting systems, but about producing people who can cope with systems, not about making a good society, but about developing good . . . [people]. (Taylor, Rockwell, & Fieldhouse, 1985, p. 41)

The Center was interested in adult education theory building in 1954 and was not afraid to bring a radical thinker to address their conference and to share his theories. This happened, of course, during a time of witch hunting in America through the McCarthyism fever. The Center mirrored the nobility of American universities that withstood the challenge of McCarthyism by disallowing outside interference on their campuses, therefore, protecting their faculties from the inquisition.

NOTES

[1]"The transportation of a community of publics into a mass society is one of the keys to the meaning of modern life. It is a structural trend that leads directly to many of the psychological and political problems that Americans, especially those concerned with liberal education, now confront. In every industrial society, these problems are of natural relevance, and in each of them the trend is rooted in the nation as a set of metropolitan areas. For it is from such metropolitan centers that there has spread those forces that are destroying or minimizing the classic liberal public and making for the ascendency of the mass society" (Mills, 1963, p. 353). These words, although written by Mills nearly 35 years ago (and reprinted in the 1963 book of Mills' essays), still have a ring of currency in many ways. The reader of this occasional paper is cordially invited to read the full essay to obtain a more complete view of the intellectual fervor that permeated the 1954 CSLEA meeting.

Whipple, J. B. (1967). *A critical balance: History of Center for the Study of Liberal Education of Adults.* Boston: CSLEA.

ADULT EDUCATION AND FEMINIST THEORY: RADICAL THINKING IN ADULT EDUCATION

Jane M. Hugo

Introduction

For the past two years, in conjunction with my adult education coursework, I have been reading about, studying, and discussing feminist scholarship, and in the process I've been trying to understand two things. First, what does feminist scholarship tell me about myself and my place in the world? Second, how might feminist scholarship inform the field of adult education? Taking a course entitled "Radical Thinking in Adult Education" gave me the opportunity to begin synthesizing the ideas I'd encountered in women's studies classes and in adult education classes.

To begin with, the course showed me that what I had been studying in women's studies courses had part of its intellectual tradition in the male-formulated theories of the sociology of knowledge, Marxism, cultural reproduction, and resistance. Although my exposure to all of these areas has been, at best, Cliffs Notes-like in character, I realized that gender was not an analytical category in these theories. As a result, while feminist theory draws on these theories, I began to see that feminist theory (and the scholarship based on it) seeks to reformulate these other theories in a radical way by insisting on using gender as the central category of analysis. In addition, I began to get clearer glimpses of how to the root of things feminist theorists would have us go--how fundamental are the challenges and the invitations feminist theory makes to the way we know ourselves and our world.

In this paper I want to explore the extent to which I'm prepared to be radicalized by feminist theory and how the field of adult education might change if it, too, allowed feminist thinking to touch it at its roots. To accomplish this goal, I'll discuss why I'm interested in feminist theory, give an overview of my understanding of what constitutes feminist theory--including how it calls for a radical re-visioning of education--and then discuss the implications feminist theory has for adult education in the United States. To conclude the paper, I'll consider how acting out of this radical perspective creates points of tension and power in my life.

A PERSONAL HISTORY

I have, I now realize, been on the edge of the women's movement for many years. My book collection testifies to an interest going back to the early seventies when I picked up copies of things written by Elizabeth Janeway, Shelia Rowbotham, Germaine Greer, and Jean Rhys. I subscribed to *MS* the first year it came out, and for a time in 1970, I belonged to a consciousness- raising group while doing my master's degree. Some of my older friends were active in the women's movement, and conversations with them would certainly have touched on the desire for a more just way for women to be in the world. In addition, I grew up in an environment peopled with lots of women. I have two sisters but no brothers. I was active in Girl Scouts well into my late twenties. I went to an "all-girl" college for three years. Two or three influential people in my life were women who had developed clear feminist views and who lived their beliefs in their work lives and their personal lives.

So, over the years I've absorbed some of the spirit of the women's movement. But, I wouldn't have called myself a feminist then, and I do so with some hesitation today. The difference between then and now, however, is twofold. First, I've had lots more personal experience living, and second, I've had the opportunity to take some women's studies courses in addition to studying various women's issues on my own. I now understand that Western culture, along with other cultures over recorded history, places men and women in differential positions by virtue of their gender (as well as by virtue of their class and race) and systematically dictates each sex's access to participation in human affairs. In general, women are relegated to a subordinate role, men to a dominant role.

While this abstract understanding has come to me through conversation and study, it feels true in regard to my life experiences and those of many women I've met. For example, as a single woman, I've felt the social expectations that "normal" meant being married and having children. I've witnessed women's exclusion from full participation in many Christian churches because Jesus and the Apostles were males, and that biological fact has been transformed into a theological qualification. I continue to be amazed that my knowledge of areas like art, science, philosophy, politics, literature, or history must be stretched to incorporate the work of women who have been silenced or made invisible by their exclusion from the accepted canons in each field. Theories of racism and classism are not sufficient to explain or help me analyze my experience. Feminist theory, however, comes closer.

FEMINIST THEORY: AN OVERVIEW

Trying to summarize feminist theory is a little like working with jello. One can see it; one can recognize its shape and substance. However, getting a hold of it is tricky. The shape changes. Some of it slips through one's fingers and some more of it melts. The mold that this paper represents should be seen as only one possible way of giving shape to the ideas.

Feminist theory is a set of interrelated principles that seek to explain women's place in the world. It is a theory that stems from the women's movement, and is intimately connected to the tenets and history of that movement. Like the women's movement, feminist theory seeks to further the liberation of women. As Charlotte Bunch (1983) says, it is not "an unengaged study of women." Instead, it is ". . . an effort to bring insights from the movement and from various female experiences together with research and data-gathering to produce new approaches to understanding and ending female oppression" (pp.249-250). Following Bunch's (1983) four-part theory model, we can examine feminist theory according to the following:

- Description - Describing what exits
- Analysis - Analyzing why that reality exists
- Vision - Determining what should exist
- Strategy - Hypothesizing how to change what is to what should be. (pp. 251-253)

Description

Naming the reality in which women live is a necessary first step in theory building. The images of women in society that surface through this description are commonly captured in the words marginal, peripheral, invisible, silent, muted, and oppressed. In reaction to centuries of discounting women's reality, feminist theory stresses the need to take seriously all women's experience and to do so on their own terms, that is, without being mediated by what feminists would call patriarchal values (Bunch, 1983; DuBois, 1983; Thompson, 1983).

Without exception, the feminist theorists examined for this paper are committed to placing women in the center of the reality they try to describe. In this way, they offer a counterpoint to the androcentrism of other theories. Furthermore, while the descriptive

mode of feminist theory redresses the absence of women in other theoretical constructs, it also names those aspects of women's experience (such as intuition, feelings, interdependence, and subjectivity) that have not been valued by positivist-based theories (Reinharz, 1983).

Analysis

The causes of sexism and women's subordination are numerous and multifaceted. Feminist theory uses concepts like patriarchy, the sex-gender system, matriarchy, gender, feminism, women's liberation, and paternalistic dominance to examine the factors at work in constructing women's realities across time and cultures (Lerner, 1986). A uniform understanding of these concepts among feminists is not to be found as yet. But, feminist theorists try to explain why women's lot is as it is by analyzing how these concepts operate in all areas of human knowledge and behavior. Biology, economics, history, religion, politics, and psychology, to name a few, are all open to scrutiny for the ways they perpetuate a gender system in which men dominate areas perceived as most valuable and, therefore, most powerful.

Nor are class and race neglected in the analytical mode of feminist theory. Feminists, however, stress the need to recognize the interrelationship of sexism, racism, and classism (Hooks, 1984; Thompson, 1983). They have also had to monitor a tendency to create what Hooks (1984) calls "hierarchies of oppression" that put sexism first and racism and/or classism second. Such segmented analysis ultimately distorts an analysis of oppression.

As part of feminist theory's "withdrawal of consent from patriarchical construction of reality" (DuBois, 1983), it tries to move away from patriarchical analytical styles. This departure means establishing alternatives to creating hierarchies, dichotomous thinking, claims of value-free research, de-contextualizing phenomena, detached research stances, a reliance on deductive logic, and researcher control over the research process. The result of such feminist efforts will be discussed later under the heading Feminist Methodology.

In conjunction with this general theoretical shift, feminist theory (under the rubric of women's studies) values crossing the disciplinary boundaries that are so much a part of our current knowledge systems. Thus, feminist theory emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary work. Researchers are encouraged to draw on several disciplines in order to fashion a more comprehensive explanation of women's experience.

Classification of Feminist Theory.

Note. From "Anatomy of difference: Toward a classification of feminist theory" by M. McFadden, 1984, *Women's Studies International Forum, 7,* p. 499. Copyright 1984 by M. McFadden. Reprinted by permission of the author.

Vision

A third aspect of feminist theory is vision, determining what should exist. Feminist theorists have a dream. In the world they envisage, the systematic subordination of women known as patriarchy is overthrown, undermined, transformed, or replaced with a system of thought, behavior, and values that corrects the subordination of half the human race. The readings sampled for this paper consistently linked this feminist vision with political action, be it teaching, doing feminist research, or celebrating

women's culture through separatist activities. While no single method for this transformation stood out, writers like Calloway (1981), Howe (1984), McFadden (1984), Spender (1980), and Thompson (1983), named the goal and set out a vision of contrast. That is to say, the vision of many feminist theorists takes its shape from being "other" in relation to patriarchical, capitalistic, or paternalist world views. For example, if men have created a world organized along the lines of dominant and subordinate power relations, the new vision is of a world organized along the lines of collaborative, shared power. Where the hegemonic culture values abstract, reified knowledge, feminist theorists look to the experiential, everyday activities of women as the medium of the needed-to-be-asked questions and the needed-to-be found truths.

McFadden (1984), in particular, offers a useful synthesis and classification of feminist visions, ranging along two continua (see Figure 1). The continua classify (a) minimizers (those feminists who would lessen the differences between the sexes by fuller integration) and (b) maximizers (those theorists who would increase the differentiation between the sexes). McFadden organizes each of these continua along a scale marking the degree of societal change advanced by a theory, i.e., radical transformation to conservative social stasis. Finally, the minimizers and maximizers are subdivided according to central themes that emerge from their theories. For example, Jane Adams and Catherine Beecher were proponents of men and women maintaining their own spheres of activity while encouraging women to become the experts in their spheres. McFadden describes this shared view in the maximizer sub-category, Separate Spheres. The minimizer sub-category, Abolish Female Reproduction, points to those radical feminist theorists who suggest that gender system disparities would be eliminated if women were no longer responsible for bearing children nor vulnerable due to menstruation or other "female" conditions. In effect, they would support the eradication of sex differences.

Whether the theorists see the system as the problem or men as the problem, they all grapple with the following questions:

> What is the nature of sex/gender difference, where does it come from, can it be changed, should it be changed? Is difference 'merely' biological, with various social overlays that are the things needing changing? Or is difference both biological and social? What part can be changed? Should any part be changed?" (McFadden, 1984, p.497)

Thus, the descriptive and analytical phases of feminist theory feed into the vision phase of the theory. Women's rights people envision a future with equal rights, on a par with men, thereby diminishing the current differences between men and women. Cultural feminists, on the other hand, celebrate the feminine by establishing feminist bookstores and having women-only music and art festivals. They wish to make visible a distinct and separate women's subculture. The variety of visions is matched by the variety of feminist strategies.

Strategy

Since feminist theory is not the "unengaged study of women," it perforce offers strategies as to how to bring about change. My reading for this paper drew on general feminist theory, feminist methodology, and feminist education. As a result, many of the strategies I encountered had to do with the construction of knowledge and changing education. In general, feminist strategies include consciousness-raising, feminist decision-making through attention to process, reclaiming lost/hidden/stolen history and power, and pressing for the creation of alternatives. In each case, women are at the center of the activity. This is, in fact, one of feminist theory's principal strategies. Earlier, in the description section, I noted that feminist theorists often described women's reality in terms of margin, periphery, invisibility, silence, mutedness, and oppression. Feminist theorists work to change this situation by putting women at the center of their work, making women's experience visible, discovering women's voices, and working for women's equality and autonomy.

Critique

Feminist theorists recognize limitations and tensions within their work. Bunch (1983), for instance, bemoans the fact that feminist theory gets stuck at the descriptive stage of theory building. Moving to subsequent stages entails confronting the complexity of women's lives in such a way that no one variable or factor can be named as the critical, universal factor in women's oppression or liberation. In addition, articulating a vision and implementing strategies involve goal setting, values clarification, and action. Although theorists can describe these processes in the ideal, it's quite another matter to put them into practice in real settings. Unlearning received ways of doing and knowing is hard; the results are still imperfect.

Callaway (1981), Hooks (1984), and Long Laws (1976, 1978), to name a few, discuss the tension that exists between theory and practice in feminist circles. With such a high premium placed on women's experience and effecting change, more activist-oriented feminists are skeptical of the real value of abstract, reflective work. They worry that academics will siphon off the power of the feminist gestalt in order to perpetuate their privileged positions. Similar issues of mistrust arise over theorists who work within the very institutions that oppress women rather than choosing to change things from outside. As McFadden (1984) illustrates, the many forms feminist theory takes accentuates (or fabricates) divisions between socialist feminists and radical feminists, or between equal rights proponents and separatists.

Thompson (1983) reminds sister feminists that their theory and the movement must address classism and racism. This is a serious challenge and critique because of the historical domination by white, middle-class women in the women's movement. This is another instance in which feminist ideals are incongruous with women's experience, even that of many women within the movement.

FEMINIST THEORY: A RADICAL VIEW OF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Despite the potential neutralizing effect of inconsistences within feminist theory, it is a radical perspective. It claims the power to change the way men and women view the world and themselves by liberating women from their subordinate position. "Revolutionary thought has always been based on upgrading the experience of the oppressed. . . . So with women" (Lerner, 1986, p. 227).

> The shift in consciousness we must make occurs in two steps: we must, at least for a time, be woman-centered. We must, as far as possible, leave patriarchal thought behind. . . . Women cannot be put into the empty spaces of patriarchal thought and systems--in moving to the center, they transform the system. . . . To step outside of patriarchal thought means: Being skeptical toward every known system of thought; being critical of all assumptions, ordering values, and definitions. p. 228)

Education is at the heart of implementing the vision of feminist theory. Echoing Gerda Lerner's observations, Mies (1983) talks about developing "emancipatory potential" through education and feminist scholarship. Dale Spender (1980) says that feminist education will help "deconstruct" oppression, "discarding the forms of thought,

the images, the symbols which restrict us and which men have constructed in the interests of maintaining a patriarchal society" (p. 18). In effect, feminist theorists assert that their challenge of "domain assumptions" (Long Laws, 1978) will transform the knowledge-making enterprise. The results will become part of the knowledge distribution system (Smith's [1977] "ideological apparatus") from which we build worldviews and upon which we base policy or law.

What does feminist education look like? It is based on women's experience. It is a collective and collaborative process. It teaches women how to assume their own autonomy, as well as how to share and acknowledge other women's autonomy. It is interdisciplinary, and it's goal is the restructuring of society. According to Howe (1984), it will be brought about by the following:

- Raising consciousness
- Compensating for the absence of women in the knowledge bases
- Building a body of research on women
- Re-visioning women's lost culture
- Changing both sexes' education by changing mainstream curriculum

The problems outlined in the earlier critique touch several aspects of feminist knowledge creation and education. Many, but not all, of the women speaking on behalf of this vision are academics whose professional training socializes them in hegemonic ways of thinking and seeing. The academy's reward system is based on this system as is those of individual disciplines. Feminist theorists find it hard to achieve recognition by their peers and to translate their training using a feminist lexicon. Ironically, language acts as one of the principal barriers to the new discourse and knowledge that academics create. Thus, the "commitment to make scholarship work on women's behalf" (DuBois, Kelly, Kennedy, Korsmeyer, & Robinson, 1985, p.197) is thrown in doubt. Furthermore, racism and classism are as imbedded in the academy as they are in society at large. The voices of women of color or economically disadvantaged women are not readily heard in the circles of the knowledge makers, even feminist ones. Finally, the debate over integration or autonomy can be divisive among feminist theorists. Is the task of transformation best served by supporting an autonomous field called women's studies or is it best served by integrating feminist perspectives into all disciplines? Is a question posed in such either/or terms a vestige of the dichotomous thinking feminists are trying to go beyond?

FEMINIST RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Feminist scholars do not want to repeat the errors of their forefathers. Drawing from feminist principles, then, these scholars have begun to articulate a feminist research methodology that is better suited to their needs and their goals. A synthesis of several methodologists' work (Callaway, 1981; Marshall, 1986; Mies, 1983; Reinharz, 1983; and Spender, 1980) yields the following list of ideal characteristics:

- Collaborative.
- Participatory.
- Acknowledges researcher's biases and reflection on experience.
- Based on the needs and interests of women in natural contexts.
- Woman-centered.
- Shows researcher awareness of constructing meaning.
- Non-hierarchical.
- Non-authoritarian.
- Non-manipulative.
- Uses grounded data-analysis.
- Linked with action within or in behalf of the women's movement.
- Reunites cognitive and affective experiences.
- Establishes new criteria to assess validity.
- Draws from a broader documentary data base.
- Inductive rather than deductive.
- Recognizes that the researcher and participants are changed by engaging in the research process together.
- Interdisciplinary.

Examining each of these characteristics is beyond the scope of this paper. My hope is that the previous discussion of feminist theory supplies sufficient rationale for the methodology. Readers are encouraged to read the citations (see especially DuBois et al., 1985) to see how this approach has been implemented in various disciplines.

Before moving on to the implications of this theory for adult education, it is important to understand that feminist research methodology is, like feminist theory, not clearly defined. The characteristics listed earlier are set in the ideal, and are not, as yet, fully functioning in the day-to-day work of feminist researchers. The reasons for

this gap between theory and practice can be traced to the divisions, differences, and tensions that are a part of this radical perspective.

FEMINIST THEORY AND ADULT EDUCATION

The Current Situation

At the 1986 Adult Education Research Conference (AERC) in Syracuse, New York, and then again at the 1987 AERC in Laramie, Wyoming, I got firsthand evidence of the field's responsiveness to feminist calls to move women from the periphery to the center and to make gender a central analytical category in the field's work. Women-centered topics (based on a review of paper titles) accounted for approximately 8% of the total program. Two presentations in particular looked at the relationship between feminist theory and adult education: one symposium at the 1986 conference (Luttrell, Meyer, & Persico, 1986) and one paper at the 1987 conference (Butterwick, 1987). While a presence in adult education, feminist theory hardly enjoys a ground swell of interest in the United States. This state of affairs is not unlike that in the field of education as a whole (DuBois et al., 1985). And yet, as one of the 1986 symposium presenters said, many adult education principles resonate with feminist ones. For example, beginning with learner experience, assuming equality between teacher and learner, and a commitment to personal and social development are a few of the points upon which many adult educators and feminist educators could find common ground. Where does the resistance to adopting feminist theory come from?

In her work, *Learning Liberation: Women's Response to Men's Education,* Thompson (1983) presents an analysis of the sexism and patriarchal hegemony in adult education theory and practice. Not surprisingly, Thompson draws our attention to the invisibility of women in the knowledge base and in the administration of the field. Many adult education curricula and the implicit view of women in those curricula (wife, parent, displaced homemaker, re-entry student--all roles in relation to men and established social roles) reinforce the existing power relations in society. The complex interaction of class, race, and gender is neglected in theory development. Women are not generally given autonomy in shaping their education and so, female students are subordinated to male organization and content. Finally, ties between the adult education field and the social structures that maintain patriarchy, (e.g., government, churches, the military, higher education, business) militate against effecting radical social change. "In many ways it [adult education] exists as a microcosm of the wider

educational system, with the same inbuilt sense of hierarchy operating to consolidate the educational and social divisions pre-empted by school in a capitalistic society" (p. 62).

An earlier report on the *International Council for Adult Education's (ICAE) Women's Project* (Bernard & Gayfer, 1981) corroborates Thompson's assessment of the subordinate place of women in adult education. The report notes that women's professional role is made invisible in the reification of development project reports. It criticizes the field's failure to value women's role in nonformal education and it's failure to go beyond economic reform to address the "traditional inequalities between women and men at home, in the workplace, in the fields, [and] in the community" (p. 60). The report also notes that "innovative programmes . . . for the participation of women in determining their economic, social, and personal needs . . . are few" (p.61). At the time of the project, funding sources were not granting major support to women-centered programs. In addition, little is disseminated about the quality and impact of programs that do exist for women.

Implementing Feminist Theory & Feminist Methodology in Adult Education: Some Possibilities

Feminist scholarship follows two strains: (a) research about the realities of women's lives, and (b) an examination of sexist institutions and ideas (DuBois et al., 1985). Following both of these avenues could transform adult education theory, practice, research, and professional preparation. How? The world view put forth by feminist theory would transform society; and feminist methodology, itself a paradigm shift, would explode much of our current understanding about ourselves and our society.

Theory

If feminist theory is to inform theory building in adult education, a first step might be a critique of existing theory. The process would start with questions like these:

- How seriously are women taken in the theory?
- What assumptions about women underpin the theory?
- How is the theory grounded in the everyday experiences of women from varying classes, races, and socio-economic backgrounds?

- To what degree does the theory support the social power relations that currently subordinate women?
- How accessible is the theory to those it describes?
- What image of women is presented in the theory?
- How does the theory respect diversity among women?
- How would the theory have to be altered to account for women's realities?

Most recently, Merriam (1987) at least begins to ask some of these questions in relation to adult learning theory. While far from asserting a radical feminist perspective, she, along with more-radical Thompson (1983) and Belenky et al. (1986), recognizes that much of the research done in this area has created a norm based on male samples or earlier research/theory constructed out of the male research model. The results, however, have been generalized to all adults. Feminist theory should be used to reassess the validity of all theories employed to explain the behavior and motivation of actors in the adult education process. This would mean re-evaluating what the field says about such topics as learner characteristics, cognitive profiles, learning and teaching styles, perspective transformation, life stage/phase development and tasks, self-directedness, and motivation. Remembering McFadden (1984), a reassessment might look quite different if done by a conservative maximizer rather than by a radical minimizer. That differences like these exist need not be counterproductive in bringing women in from the margin, however.

Practice

An infusion of feminist theory into adult education practice would mean operationalizing the following ideal characteristics to some degree greater than is currently done: women-centered learning; collaborative structures; critical- problem approach; development of an atmosphere of mutual trust, respect, and community; shared leadership; integration of cognitive and affective learning; and an action orientation. These characteristics would be implemented not only at the classroom level but also in nonformal educational settings, at the program level, and at the administrative level. In order for women to have more than equal access to oppressive structures, they have to be active in idea and policy formulation.

What would the serious implementation of feminist adult education do to the Commission of Professors of Adult Education, a typical continuing education program, an international development program, a literacy program, a corporate training

program, adult religious education, or graduate-level courses on adult teaching methods? Is the intention to exclude male reality from these arenas? The answer is no. A deeper understanding of women's experience and the ubiquitous nature of sexism should, however, warrant changing those aspects of professional practice that support sexism, e.g., sex segregation in the field; linking much of women's programming with social roles of wife, mother, or displaced homemaker; ignoring the ramifications of gender issues in teaching materials; using sexist language; failing to provide adequate conceptual skill training to promote analysis; not encouraging innovative programming for non-middle-class women and not disseminating the results of programs that do exist; or avoiding involvement in social change because market forces aren't paying for that now.

Research

Research is crucial to transforming patriarchal society. If women's experience and the sexism of institutions and ideas are not documented, then the knowledge needed to change ourselves, society, policies, values, and behavior will not be available. As stated earlier, feminist theory calls into question all knowledge. Based on that assumption, feminist theory lays out a radical research agenda for adult education. Accepted assumptions about learning, learners, participation, barriers, the interrelationships between social and economic factors in education, etc. must be "checked out" against feminist theoretical concepts, and, if necessary, revised or discarded.

DuBois et al. (1985) notes that the field of education tends toward empirical research. When the field studies gender categories, rather than making women a major focus of research, ". . . it was to question previous research on sex differences in educational abilities and outcomes that have prevailed in the discipline, its research, and its translation into school practice" (p. 25). As a result, education has expended more effort on understanding "the sexist institutions and ideologies within which women's activity is contained" (p. 67). It has given less attention to how women live, work, or learn, and thereby given less attention to "women's agency." Adult education, while engaging in a study of its own sexism, could benefit the field of education by addressing the lives of adult women and their learning/teaching activities inside and outside educational institutions. Other researchable questions might be concerned with the following: the process of women teaching other women; self-concept and motivation in relation to women's social, cultural, economic, and political condition in

society; how women handle the social or cultural tensions that education creates within social networks; the extent to which women feel female ways of doing and knowing are equal in value to male ways of doing and knowing; the compromises many women have to make in relation to work and education; or the historical role women have played in shaping adult education around the world.

Finally, doing adult education research according to feminist research methodology would challenge the hold that logical-positivistic research has on the field. Feminist methodology affects the nature of the researcher's role in that it values the researcher's personal and reflective involvement in the process. Using collaborative or participatory techniques, the audience for the research results is no longer only one's peers in the profession or related professions. Instead, the results are important for the researcher's development (for me), the research community (for them), and the participants' development (for us) (Marshall, 1986). The value of researchable questions would come from their connection to women's lives in particular contexts. Notions of generalizability and validity would have to be revised to accommodate the type of results coming from collaborative research.

Professional Preparation

Transforming theory, practice, and research cannot be done independently of transforming professional preparation. Feminist theory and methodology have implications for this area as well. Graduate students in adult education cannot hope to adopt a feminist perspective without first understanding feminist theory and using process-oriented feminist methodology. How can we learn to work collaboratively, creating environments of trust as teachers and learners both, if we maintain hierarchical systems within our departments or if we preserve what Freire called the "banking" style of education? How can practicioners become knowledgeable about gender issues if the literature and research they study does not reflect the issues? (For example, see Howe's [1984] list of women's scholarship topics in Appendix A.). How do we learn to move our theory from description to analysis, vision, and strategies for action unless we are helped to do this during our professional preparation? Questions like these point to the fundamental re-visions indicated when implementing feminist theory and methodology. The issue under consideration is not simply the "unengaged study of women," but rather the adoption of a gestalt, a world view, that calls forth new ways of seeing and doing.

A PERSONAL RESPONSE

Having started this paper with a glimpse of my interest in feminist theory and the place of women in society, I want to finish it in the same way. All that I read and wrote about in this paper creates personal tension as well as power in me. Taken seriously, the women's movement, feminist theory, and feminist research methodology affect how I see myself in relation to men and other women and in relation to the institutions within which I work or live. To what extent am I prepared to be radicalized? I don't know; I don't know how my limits will change over time or how conditions will change in time. I am not a path breaker, and I seem to have more tolerance for contradictions than most radicals I know. In McFadden's (1984) classification, I am a conservative to moderately radical feminist maximizer/minimizer already, depending on the topic and the situation. I don't think that I'm fickle, but rather that different topics and different situations call for different stances. I am not likely to ever be a true radical on either continuum as she describes it. Perhaps a look at my points of tension and power will help explain my position.

Tensions

Adopting a feminist approach is unsettling. I am different, changed, as a result of my immersion in feminist theory over these last two years. I no longer like off-handed remarks about rape or gays or Blacks. I notice male-female ratios in bibliographies or faculty listings. I am angry that Malcolm Knowles' history of Adult Education contains less than twenty references to individual female contributors to the field and over a hundred references to individual male contributors. In short, I've become sensitized to some issues of oppression and women's invisibility. I feel I should redress the problem in some way, and I don't always know where to begin. In addition, this awareness and a willingness to act out of that awareness does not necessarily match that of my friends, family, or colleagues. Losing some of the common ground we have is scarey. It tests, in a way, the depth of those relationships.

Another point of tension is the ambiguity of how to do feminist theory or methodology. I don't have a lot of models to follow, and consequently, I feel tentative, in my best moments, about whether I'm doing "it" right or not. I don't know how to do collaborative or participatory research. I only have theoretical notions of how to translate feminist theory into action-based adult education in which the learners experience interdependence as well as autonomy. I am in a quandary as to what to

take from my past into this new future that feminist theory projects. In other words, I find it hard in many instances to unlearn what I have taken for granted as the norm. A small example of this is my socialization as a teacher. In that role, I was the expert and the authority. If anything, I have become more of an expert and an authority by virtue of doing a Ph.D program. However, I am very much in the process of learning how to blend expertise with egalitarian ideas of education.

A final point of tension parallels one in the women's movement itself, integration versus autonomy. Given the radical implications of feminist theory and methodology, is it possible to work within the patriarchal educational system? Is real change more possible outside the system? I don't have my answer for either question yet. I know better the pitfalls of working within the system: co-optation, serving the needs of the institution to the detriment of students' needs, getting caught up in a competitive, academic style. Outside the system, there seems to be a lack of funding, little prestige as an independent scholar, and less access to shaping what others take to be "knowledge." Myles Horton (founder of the Highlander Folk School) and Hilda Smith (the main force behind the workers' summer school at Bryn Mawr from 1921 to 1938) are examples of people who took one or the other path, and seem to have succeeded in living out their values. Maybe the either/or dichotomy is inappropriate once again.

Power

Feminist scholarship is exciting for me. Underlying such scholarship is a somewhat cohesive vision through which I feel as though I am doing something meaningful--even if only at the descriptive level of feminist theory. While I may become more angry as I better understand women's subordination and women's participation in that subordination, feminist scholarship in adult education offers me an avenue of re-action and re-creation. Over the long run, I may become cynical, but I don't have to become bitter. I am empowered by being a part of a movement that is asking new questions and struggling to articulate the answers.

REFERENCES

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Bernard, A., & Gayfer, M. (1981). Women hold up more than half the sky: Report of the ICAE Women's Project. *Convergence,14* (4), 59-71.

Bunch, C. (1983). Not by degrees: Feminist theory and education. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack (Eds.), *Learning our way: Essays in feminist education* (pp. 248-260). Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.

Butterwick, S. (1987). Learning liberation: A comparative analysis of feminist consciousness-raising and Freire's conscientization method. *Proceedings for the Twenty-Eighth Annual Adult Education Research Conference*, 19-24. Laramie, Wyoming: University of Wyoming.

Caffarella, R., & Olson, S. (1986). The psychosocial development of women: A critical review of the literature. *Proceedings for the Twenty-Seventh Annual Adult Education Research Conference,* 43-48. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University.

Callaway, H. (1981). Women's perspectives: Research as re-vision. *Convergence, 14*(4), 34-42.

DuBois, B. (1983). Passionate scholarship: Notes on values, knowing and method in feminist social science. In G. Bowles & R. Duelli Klein (Eds.), *Theories of women's studies* (pp.105-116). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

DuBois, E.C., Kelly, G., Kennedy, E., Korsmeyer, C., & Robinson, L. (1985). *Feminist schclarship: Kindling in the groves of academe.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Hooks, B. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center.* Boston: South End Press.

Howe, F. (1984). Feminist scholarship: The extent of the revolution (1981-1982). In F. Howe (Ed.), *Myths of coeducation: Selected essays, 1964-1983* (pp. 270-284). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lerner, G. (1986). *The creation of patriarchy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Long Laws, J. (1976). *Patriarchy as paradigm: The challenge from feminist scholarship.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York.

Long Laws, J. (1978). *Feminism and patriarchy: Competing ways of doing social science.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.

Luttrell, W., Meyer, S., & Persico, C., (1986). Using research on women to reshape concepts about adult learners and learning. *Proceedings for the Twenty-Seventh Annual Adult Education Research Conference,* 345-350. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University.

Marshall, J. (1986). Exploring the experiences of women managers: Towards rigour in qualitative methods. In S. Wilkinson (Ed.), *Feminist social psychology: Developing theory and practice.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

McFadden, M. (1984). Anatomy of difference: Toward a classification of feminist theory. *Women's Studies International Forum, 7,* 495-504.

Merriam, S. (1987). Adult learning and theory building: A review. *Adult Education Quarterly, 37* , 187-198.

Mies, M. (1983). Towards a methodology for feminist research. In G. Bowles & R. Duelli Klein (Eds.), *Theories of women's studies* (pp.117-139). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Reinharz, S. (1983). Experiential analysis: A contribution to feminist research. In G. Bowles & R. Duelli Klein (Eds.), *Theories of women's studies* (pp.162-191). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Schniedewind, N. (1983). Feminist values: Guidelines for teaching methodology in women's studies. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack (Eds.), *Learning our way: Essays in feminist education* (pp.261-271). Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.

Smith, D. (1977). A sociology of women. In J. Sherman & E. Beck (Eds.), *The prism of sex* (pp. 135-187). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Spender, D. (1980). Learning to create our own knowledge. *Convergence, 13,* 14-22.

Thompson, J. (1983). *Learning Liberation: Women's response to men's education.* London: Croom Helm.

APPENDIX A

Note. The following list of areas of women's scholarship and the curriculum of women's studies is directly quoted from an essay by Howe (1984) entitled "Feminist Scholarship: The Extent of the Revolution (1981-1982)," in *Myths of Coeducation: Selected Essays, 1964-1983.* The list originally appeared in an essay by Howe written to introduce a special double issue on women and education for the *Harvard Educational Review* in 1981.

1. An understanding of patriarchy in historical perspective; philosophically and sociologically: its relationship to religions of the world, and to ideas of knowledge and power--hence, an understanding of what it means to be born "permanently" into a subordinate or dominant status; a knowledge of feminist history.
2. An understanding of the complex, confusing, and still chaotic area of biological/psychological sex differences; the importance of null findings.
3. An understanding of socialization and sex roles, as well as of sex-role stereotyping: the relationships among gender, race, and class-- all from a cross-cultural perspective.
4. An understanding of women in history, not only in the United States but throughout the world: recognizing that such study includes legal as well as medical history--the history of birth control, for example, is essential to the study of women, even to the study of fiction about women.
5. An understanding of women as represented in the arts they have produced, some of which have been buried or ignored as arts--quilting, for example, or the pottery of North American Indian women; and as represented in the significant literature by women of all races and nationalities that was never included in the literary curriculum; as well as an awareness that the images of women portrayed by the male-created arts have helped control the dominant conceptions of women--hence, the importance of studying images of women on TV, in the film and in the theater, and in advertising.
6. An understanding of the ways in which post-Freudian psychology has attempted to control women's destiny; an awareness that other male-centered psychological constructs like those of Erikson and Kohlberg are potentially

damaging to women; an understanding of new women-centered theories of female development.

7. An understanding of female sexuality, including perspectives on both heterosexuality and lesbianism; special issues involved in birth control and reproduction.

8. An understanding of the history and function of education as support and codifier of sex segregation and of limited opportunities for women; some perspectives on education as an agent for change in the past and present.

9. An understanding of the history and function of the family in the United States and cross-culturally; of the current variety of family structures, and of the conflict between beliefs and research findings with reference especially to issues surrounding children.

10. An understanding of women in the work force through history, in the present, and cross culturally; the economy in relation to women; the relationship between money and power in personal interactions, in the family, and in society.

11. An understanding of the relationship between laws affecting women and social change; the history of women and social movements.

ON THE IDEA OF AN EMANCIPATORY PEDAGOGY

Brent Robinson Snow

Introduction

In recent years, a number of radical adult educators have written about educational concerns or practices that have to do with helping learners develop informed, evaluative perspectives on their own actions and interests. For instance, Freire's (1970, 1985) problem-posing learning; the feminist consciousness-raising approaches described by Bunch and Pollack (1983), Butterwick (1987), Treichler (1986), and others; Gramsci's counter-hegemonic education; and Shor's (1980) critical teaching all purport to help learners develop such perspectives, often termed "critical" perspectives.

Underscoring these various approaches are three important assumptions: (a) that many of our beliefs and values are the product of habit, precedent, and tradition; (b) that an unquestioning attitude towards these beliefs and values may result in actions that are counter-productive to our own interests; and (c) that critically assessing our beliefs, values and actions may allow us to act in truer accordance with our interests. Habermas (1971) provides a lengthy description of these assumptions, and he suggests that developing critical perspectives on our taken-for-granted ways of thinking about the world is a necessary step in the process of emancipation. He calls this wish to free ourselves from the social forces that oppress us our "emanicipatory interest," and he claims that "critical theories" speak to this interest.

Various interpreters of Habermas describe this emancipatory interest somewhat more succinctly than does Habermas himself. According to Geuss (1981), "Critical theories aim at . . . making agents aware of hidden coercion, thereby freeing them from that coercion and putting them in a position to determine where their true interests lie" (p. 55). Bredo and Feinberg (1982, p. 279) suggest that critical theory helps to emancipate by showing how particular beliefs and values have become dysfunctional. That is, they show how current beliefs and values may have made sense at an earlier time when they fitted their practical social contexts--and the way in which those social contexts have changed--the result being that people become better able to understand

---

A shortened and modified version of this article appeared in the spring 1988 *Participatory Formation Newsletter* of the International Council of Adult Education.

current distortions and the interests that they serve. And Fay (1987) who subsumes critical theory within the larger frame of critical social science, describes this emancipatory project in practical terms: critical social science seeks "to be practical in the sense of being a catalyst for fundamental social change . . . the process by which this is effected consisting of two elements: the education of its audience and their empowerment" (p. 85).

These are seemingly admirable intentions. Embedded in the idea of emancipation are images of the unshackling of oppression, of gaining the power and means to live freely, of equality. Yet they are hazy intentions as well. What exactly does critical theory mean by emancipation? What might an emancipated person "look like"? How is this education and empowerment supposed to take place? Indeed, what sorts of pedagogies might be developed out of a such a theory? Given its purported practical interest, it is curious that many critical theories seem to offer few clear answers to these questions. Most often, they present extremely opaque descriptions of some sociopolitical phenomena and give us little indication of how they might be put to practical use. Critical theories, it seems, have consistently fallen short of their own practical ideals. They are alienating instead of empowering, mystifying instead of educating.

Yet if the critical theories of Habermas and others have thus far been unable to offer clear answers to the above questions, what do we make of the aforementioned educational approaches, which specifically seek to help learners develop critical perspectives on their own situations? Perhaps these practical attempts can tell us more about the form of this so-called emancipatory interest. For example, how is this interest rendered in the feminist attempts at "consciousness raising," in Freire's process of "conscientization," or in the more radically individualistic "human potential movement" courses offered by the Esalen Institute, EST, and others?

THREE APPROACHES

In the questions above I refer to three different approaches--those of the women's movement, of Freire, and of the human potentialists. The women's movement, and the feminist pedagogies that have grown out of it, have deeply affected whole areas of North American social life--from the way people raise their children, carve out careers, divide family responsibilities, and so on (Fay, 1987). Likewise, the effect of Paulo Freire's work is felt in many corners of the world, and in this country one can find many pedagogical proposals that specifically draw on it (Giroux, 1983; Reed, 1981; Shor,

1980). And in various therapeutic and educational guises, the human potential movement has permeated much of this culture's post-sixties language and thinking (Anderson, 1983; Mosatche, 1983; Rossman, 1979).

Thus, I have chosen to discuss these three approaches because each, in significant ways, is foundational to whole constellations of educational proposals which "seek to emancipate" learners. There are, of course, other approaches that don't draw directly on any of these--such as certain of the Eastern mystic traditions--but in the Western context these three approaches are significant examples of how this emancipatory ideal gets worked out pedagogically.

In discussing each of these approaches, I will attempt to describe what the underlying structure of the emancipatory process seems to be, what pedagogical methods derive from it, and what the learners are to be emancipated from and to. Because my condensed descriptions of each approach must leave out much of the rich detail and ignore the wide varieties of permutations and combinations, readers interested in more complete descriptions of these possibilities are referred to the specific works cited in the text.

The Feminist Pedagogies

Although I could find no universally agreed upon approach within the feminist literature, there do seem to be certain principles and phases that are common to most descriptions of feminist consciousness raising (Bunch & Pollack, 1983; Butterwick, 1987; Schniedewind, 1983; Treichler, 1986). According to Butterwick (1987), consciousness raising is about developing ideology grounded in women's day-to-day reality and consists of four general phases. Opening up is the first phase and is where trust and intimacy are developed. Sharing then emphasizes women teaching one another and understanding the common nature of women's problems. Sharing then serves as raw data for the third phase, analysis, where other information, such as studies and books, are used to gain a better understanding of social-historical conditions as well as the specific nature of the problems. Finally, there is abstraction, in which a holistic view of women's oppression is acquired and priorities and strategies for change worked on.

A pedagogy seeking to engender this consciousness raising process would also follow a number of general principles (Schniedewind, 1983). The first of these is that feminist pedagogy demands the integration of egalitarian content and process. Thus, content generally includes scholarship by and about women and concerns the

relationship between the personal subordination of women and broader political, economic, and social structures. One particularly strong and recurring theme in this regard is that "the personal is the political." Also, examples and visions of egalitarian alternatives are often discussed.

Because many feminists feel that students learn as much from the process of a course--its hidden curriculum--as they do from its explicit content, efforts are made to have classroom interaction based on feminist principles. Thus, egalitarian processes are integrated with content through efforts to replace the hierachical forms of authority with participatory decision making and more democratic structures. Accordingly, teachers attempt to share leadership with both students and other instructors. Students are involved in helping structure the class at the outset and they are asked to give input throughout the course on what ways the course can be changed/improved. This input is considered by the class as a whole, and decisions are made democratically about what changes/improvements to make.

Second, specific process skills are taught to promote an atmosphere of mutual respect, trust, and community in the classroom. For example, various activities are used to help students become acquainted with each other on a more personal level. Interpersonal communication skills, which are effective in producing an honest classroom atmosphere, are taught, and discussions and activities concerning various group-dynamics phenomena are encouraged.

Third, cooperative structures and norms are encouraged through such processes as (a) using activities that individuals can complete successfully if, and only if, all others with whom they are linked do likewise--in other words, the group sinks or swims together; (b) breaking down large groups into smaller groups for discussion; (c) encouraging cooperative, rather than individual, term projects; (d) establishing personal and academic support groups; and (e) establishing grading systems that don't reinforce competitive norms such as pass/fail grading or contract grading.

Fourth, students are encouraged to engage in action in addition to thought, and they also analyze that action in order to improve perspectives and the efficacy of their efforts. In short, space is made for them to talk about strategies for incorporating theory and practice.

Finally, efforts are made to integrate affective and cognitive learning, with the point being to change the overly rational premises of male-dominated social relations and institutions, and to incorporate priorities appreciative of human needs and feelings. Some frequently used techniques for increasing affective learning include keeping journals; using experiential activities--structured participatory experiences to draw out

feelings--to help elicit personal and social learning and to help students relate personally with course content; asking questions about the material that require students to make personal connections; using literature, poetry, and songs in course work as a means to infuse with feelings unevoked by much analytic writing.

Two points are important to mention at this juncture. First, the term consciousness raising suggests that the learner's consciousness needs to be raised, or that their current consciousness (of themselves and their situations) is somehow inadequate. Second, the term implies that there is a more adequate consciousness available, one that is morally and/or epistemologically superior.

What allows feminists to imply these things is their analysis of the social-historical world from an ontology that holds that all people should have certain powers of self-determination in an egalitarian world, with cooperation supplanting competition. Also, feminists believe that individuals can learn knowledge and skills that will enable them to better control their lives.

Such an analysis is likely to reveal, claim feminists, that women are more subject to various conditions of oppression than are men. That is, the analysis provides a critique of the ideology that characterizes many women's (and by implication, men's) thinking about themselves and their world, and its primary function has been to enlighten these women, whose suffering is seen, at least in part, as the result of their being unwitting cooperators in maintaining social practices that caused them to think, act, and feel in self-defeating ways (Fay, 1987).

Consequently, self-conceptions of these women, including their knowledge of the social and political practices that impact upon their experience in the world, are seen as epistemologically inferior to forms of knowledge that recognize and describe the existing inequalities in social relations. Consciousness raising is seen as a process of moving people towards new self-conceptions that are epistemologically and morally superior to the old self-conceptions.

The Pedagogy of Paulo Freire

Without a doubt, the work of Paulo Freire has had a significant impact on the conceptualization and formation of a whole family of critical pedagogies. Many employ bits and pieces of his thinking--claiming primacy for those particulars that best address local needs and understandings--while others make fuller use of his work in their pedagogical proposals. Attempting to account for all of these variations is not my purpose here; thus, I will only describe the general features of the Freirean pedagogy.

There is, I believe, a singular process that is fundamental to his approach and many of its derivatives. Using coordinators who co-investigate with a group of people in a community, problem situations common to all are identified and codified into words, pictures, drawings, etc. At this point, learners engage in a process of decodification, which Freire (1985) describes as follows:

> The first stage of decodification--or reading--is descriptive. At this stage, the 'readers'--or decodifiers--focus on the relationship between the categories constituting the codification. This preliminary focus on the surface structure is followed by 'problematizing' the codified situation. This leads the learner to the second and fundamental stage of decodification, the comprehension of the codification's deep structure. By understanding the codifications' deep structure the learner can then understand the dialectic that exists between the categories presented in the surface structure, as well as the unity between surface and deep structure. The aim of decodification is to arrive at a critical level of knowing, beginning with the students' experience of the situation in the "real context." (p. 52)

This critical level of knowing is what Freire (1985) refers to as "conscientization," which he asserts is ". . . a deepening awareness of both the sociocultural reality that shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality" (p. 93), and for him it is the foundation of emancipation. What it is that the learners are to be emancipated from follows from his analysis--influenced by Christianity, Marxism, and existentialism--of an oppressive situation in Brazil in which there is a "culture of silence" and what he calls the "naive consciousness" of people caught in the transition from a "closed" to "open" society.

As with the feminist literature, there is a clear argument in Freire's work that this "naive consciousness" is somehow dysfunctional for these people. Although some writers have taken issue with the implication of a "hierarchy of consciousness" (Berger, 1974), Freire's justification for his position follows from the importance he places on individual autonomy. This autonomy, for him, involves the freedom to transform reality. It also constitutes the standards against which learners are to be measured; that is, the degree to which they become able to redefine or transform their situation (Shor & Freire, 1987). Furthermore, Freire (1985) sees the person as a being who needs to live a life that is intentionally created and recreated, and he sees our vocation as humans to be that of continually striving to do more (p.195).

As a consequence of these beliefs, Freire (Shor & Friere, 1987) claims that the educator's role is one of critical intervention, beginning with the felt needs of the learner. The educator does not simply cater to these needs, but rather contends that they derive from an oppression that comes from within the individual as well as from without. In this way, the educators seek to bring about the problematization or questioning of these felt needs as to their causes--which Freire claims is a necessary process if people are to be freed from blind adherence to their own worldviews as well as others' worldviews, which may have been uncritically internalized--and they guide the learners in exploration of worldviews that are more adequate to their situation.

A Pedagogy For Personal Autonomy

Sometime in the early 1970's, there began a number of new activities, which were variously called the human potential movement, the encounter group movement, the personal growth movement, and sometimes even simply the "consciousness" movement. That this phenomenon, which for the purposes of this paper I will call the human potential movement, has even been called a movement may in part have been a carryover from the various student and New Left movements of the sixties, but it is also indicative of the ground swell of numerous programs and proposals that aimed to enlighten and transform the individuals who sought them out (Anderson, 1983; Mosatche, 1983; Rossman, 1979).

There seems to be a diverse array of programs and proposals representing a somewhat incoherent variety of beliefs, perspectives, and techniques; however, these programs and proposals also seem to share a similar underlying process which, in most instances, claims to engender some form of personal transformation and/or emancipation. The goal of this process--to effect a heightened self- and contextual-awareness--appears to be quite similar to that of the feminists and the Freireans, and it is best understood by example.

Thinking of this emancipatory "move" in terms of an adult education class, rather than a human potential group, there is first a general discussion, led by the teacher, about how people conduct themselves as good students in the social space of a classroom. Then there is a reflexive (self-descriptive) move, in which the instructor begins to point out the ways each person in the class is at that moment playing out the detailed social roles of "good student" that they have been conditioned (and have conditioned themselves) to play--even in the very act of describing their own conditioning to the instructor and the class. This process continues in ever more

vigorous fashion as the instructor (aided by a growing core of willing critics--"good students" all) further points out to students how they still can't stop playing their conditioned roles, even knowing they are doing it. The dissonance and confusion mount as the students' sense of reality begins to come apart, and then there is a snap, a leap of consciousness, as first one student in detached amazement or angry rebellion, and then others, realize that not only their acts, but the situations which they support, are only voluntary constructs, limited and limiting, which, with this new knowledge, they may now begin to re-create. (This description is adapted from Rossman, 1979, pp. 118-124). In short, the students are seen as becoming more aware of their own constructions of self; hence, liberated from their accustomed ways of acting, thinking, and feeling within the classroom.

This general process, played out in many of the so-called human potential groups, seems to fit neatly within the aim of a critical theory as it is described by Geuss (1981) above, (e.g., "making agents aware of hidden coercion, thereby freeing them from that coercion and putting them in a position to determine where their true interests lie" (p. 55). Yet , whereas the proponents of a critical theory provide a rationale for the superior epistemological status of their worldview, can we find such a rationale undergirding the clearly manipulative acts of the instructor in the above example?

Part of the answer to this question lies in the core of ontological beliefs and values of much of the human potential literature. We find the presupposition that we can freely recreate our personal lives as we experience them in the world and also, that we are responsible for who we are and what we do; in short, that we gain autonomy through recognizing this personal responsibility. Moreover, gaining greater autonomy is believed to be something humans desire and also something that is good.

However, there are many situations in which we may act in certain ways without thinking about why it is that we act that way. Or we don't think about our acting in certain ways as being a matter of choice. Thus, in the example above, the students didn't generally think about their own complicity in maintaining a certain type of social arrangement in a classroom setting--whereas the instructor was aware of this dynamic, and from this vantage point was able to create a process that essentially forced the students to become more aware of this dynamic, indeed, forced them to confront their own unwitting complicity in maintaining it.

In learning more truly about their situation, human potentialists believe that students/group members also come to realize that the general senses of frustration, impotence, oppression, etc., and the ways they go about acting these out in the world, are very much of their own creation--old programs, so to speak, which once

recognized can be discarded and replaced with new programs. Human potentialists, therefore, seek to help learners encounter and transcend their own habits of shaping their consciousnesses.

It is a vision in which personal autonomy is most often described as a state of reflective clarity about our actions and wants such that we take responsibility for how it is we feel and act. That is, we are seen as volitional beings who are responsible for our feelings and actions; in other words, we "choose" our feelings and actions. Human potentialists believe freedom comes from recognizing our own complicity in this regard, and recognizing that we have many such "choices."

FREEDOM FROM WHAT: ANTONIO GRAMSCI

How is it that these approaches claim to illuminate our "true interests" among the range of possible interests we might hold? Emancipation implies freedom from what? From the inherited traditions and culturally given meanings of a constituted public? From the oppressive manifestations of this inheritance? In the final section of this paper, I discuss the pedagogical proposals of Gramsci (1971) in relation to these questions, and I argue that his proposals raise important questions about the approaches described above, as well as the general project of critical theory.

The Radical Pedagogy of Gramsci

This thinker and activist was concerned with radical sociopolitical change and his work ought to be especially relevant for radicals committed to the sort of adult education described above. Yet as Entwistle (1979) states, "It is by no means clear that a close examination of Gramsci's work would confirm him as an authority for the radical rhetoric of much contemporary neo-Marxist educational theory and, especially, for that of those 'new' sociologists of education who invoke his name" (p. 1). Indeed, it would seem that while much of Gramsci's work, particularly as it is illustrated in his concept of "hegemony" would support the emancipatory aim of pedagogical proposals mentioned above, his recommendations regarding the content and process of the educational interventions are quite different. First, however, the similarities.

Gramsci's concept of hegemony is closely related to the previously mentioned idea that we have certain beliefs and values that are the product of habit, precedent, and tradition. The critical theorists generally talk about these beliefs and values as being

historically given, and often uncritically accepted, and Gramsci would agree. They are, in his words,

> the 'spontaneous' consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group. This consent is 'historically' caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production. (1971, p.12)

In much the same way as the critical theorists, Gramsci suggests that education is integral to the task of helping break the dominant group's hegemony over an oppressed group's minds, and he describes such education as counter-hegemonic. Embedded in this notion of counter-hegemonic education is the assumption that the oppressed groups need to come to think like a ruling class--which suggests that they come to see themselves as autonomous in the way we presume rulers to somehow be (Entwistle, 1979, p. 15).

Likewise, Gramsci suggests the worldview of the learners may not be an adequate philosophical basis for revolutionary praxis. Entwistle (1979) explains:

> If [certain] subaltern classes are under the control of the hegemonic class, it is their own often superstitious, folkloristic conception of the world which is favorable to maintenance of the status quo it is exactly how hegemony works: when [oppressed] classes spontaneous cultural perceptions are that the social order could not be other than it is. (p. 31)

In short, Gramsci also felt that some thought systems are epistemologically superior to others.

However, whereas the critical educators discussed earlier tended to base the content and process of their pedagogy on the learner's experience and situation, Gramsci felt that the epistemologically superior thought systems were often contained in the curriculum content of formal educational institutions. He claims these knowledge categories are politically powerful because they offer more logical, coherent, systematic, and complete accounts of the sociopolitical universe, and hence, that having access to these categories would be beneficial to any oppressed group wanting to understand the mechanisms of social control. Also, he believed process

and content should be grounded in many of the norms and values of these institutions (Entwistle, p. 31).

Thus, in strong contrast to the progressive proposals of the educators above, Gramsci's prescriptions for curriculum and teaching method are essentially conservative. He would in fact suggest that the sorts of progressive education described above have intimations of political authoritarianism, (see Entwistle, p. 2 and p. 180 for detail), while the sorts of traditional, didactic schooling practices are essential requirements for that temper of mind on which radical social criticism depends. He emphasizes the value of traditional educational practice with reference to the content and processes of schooling, particularly with respect to the development of what he calls "good sense" within "common sense."

"Common sense" is the spontaneous, unconscious worldview that all men have and that implicitly contains a philosophy characterized by a particular mixture of religion, superstition, folklore, daily empirical experience, and science. To be in school is to be moving towards philosopher's philosophy [good sense]. Entwistle, quoting Gramsci, notes:

> This [common sense] contrasts with philosophy as intellectual order, a conception of the world which is a coherent unity raised to the level reached by the most advanced thought in the world. At this level of intellectual coherence one has the capacity to work out critically and consciously one's own conception of the world, be one's own guide. This is a description of the autonomous, rational man traditionally conceived as the outcome of a traditional education. (p. 33)

Traditional schooling, then, is concerned with the development of good sense "within" common sense, a state of mind in which "common sense" is purged of its superstition and incoherence (p. 33). This transformation requires the active intervention of specialists (rather than egalitarian coordinators) who function as authorities with reference to human knowledge, having special claim, on epistemological grounds, to define what ought to count as educational knowledge (p. 36). Gramsci then sees this knowledge as a resource for subsequent self-education and cultural innovation.

Accordingly, Gramsci recommended the study of history, philosophy, literature, and science, though he was concerned that abstract learning also attend to its relationship with the concrete. He argued that it was the task of the school to transmit

this good sense effectively; hence evaluation and some sort of examination is intrinsic to the functions of the school, especially as means of fair and equitable measurement of relative merit distinct from educationally irrelevant criteria such as wealth, privilege, etc.

Gramsci also felt schooling was work, rather than just something that was to be spontaneous and natural. Consequently, his pedagogy emphasized discipline, both externally imposed and self-imposed, and he felt there could be no learning without effort, drill, even drudgery (Entwistle, p. 53). Other Gramsci recommendations follow similar form, and they adhere closely to his insistence that work is the key to social organization and human culture in general. In this sense, all education for Gramsci is vocational education.

Some Implications

The "critical" interest raises some important questions about the ends and means of our various educational practices. What exactly are our educational interventions supposed to accomplish? For critical social science, and the critical educationalist, the answer resides in some sort of emancipatory ideal and necessarily involves the development of some sort of critical awareness, or consciousness. The type of knowledge taught is "self" knowledge; that is, knowledge of one's relations in the world and of one's potential capacity to alter them. It is, as Fay (1987) describes it, critical social science's construal of that Biblical adage "the truth shall set you free," with the educator's role being that of helping to reveal to an oppressed audience their true situation, and their capacity to change it (p. 205).

For Gramsci, this is not enough. People cannot become completely autonomous simply by understanding their situation and setting about to change it. The very cultural baggage which they may gain reflective clarity on is that which gives them their identities. They can't establish new identities without somehow employing this material provided by their own tradition. As Fay (1987) puts it, "every act of self-determination involves working through material appropriated by their heritage" (p. 208). Consequently, Gramsci suggests a different tack, one which highlights the transmission of culture and technological know-how as a precursor to this critical awareness. Such knowledge, he argues, is precisely what has enabled some groups to dominate others. Indeed, it is his contention that one should learn from one's adversary, whom one should be careful not to belittle (Entwistle, p. 31).

We have then, two sides to the same question: How can education help oppressed people become less oppressed? Critical theories begin with an ideal of autonomy and follow that with a critique of a status quo that doesn't allow people to realize this ideal in their lives. Its purpose is to help people recognize their oppression, and this recognition is seen as a necessary, and in some cases, a sufficient, condition for its removal. The educational approaches of the feminists, Freireans, and human potentialists have each indicated how this might be achieved.

Gramsci suggests that we need the "wisdom of the disciplines" to become less oppressed, and such wisdom requires rigorous training, and in some cases, conformity to standards that are used by those already in power. This is not the ideal of autonomy suggested by critical theory nor the critical educational approaches, and it raises, I believe, important questions for both. Is it possible that this ideal of autonomy results in another dysfunctional worldview, one that causes us to set unrealistic educational goals? If the answer to this question is yes, as I hope the preceeding analysis has suggested, how might we begin to construe a radical adult education that doesn't downplay how dependent humans are on events outside themselves and their possible control?

While it is not the purpose of this paper to suggest a new form of radical adult education, I would like to suggest, by way of conclusion, that the term "radical" refers to a process of getting at the root of things. Yet it is not simply a matter of stripping away the layers of dirt covering the roots of social relations to first expose them, and second, transplant them. It is also a matter of understanding the specific embodiment of those particular roots with all of their immutable limitations, and also understanding their sources of strength and nourishment.

What nourishes and gives strength to the concept of emancipation, as well as to the concepts of freedom and liberation, are their rich and related histories. What we can imagine is not a "new program," but rather, some reinterpretation of the old one, some invocation of a language and a tradition that still speaks to us. Their history is their power.

One such powerful language and tradition in adult education comes from Eduard Lindeman, who, at the end of a book written over 50 years ago, details some of the beliefs that underscore a form of education he calls "social education." I will conclude with several of these still quite pertinent beliefs:

1. In spite of our differences, there exists a compulsion which obliges us to seek some form of co-operative and collaborative living.

2. The most important facts in a social situation are not susceptible to observation and analysis by an outside observer.

3. The role of leader in a social situation is to discover and assure the integrative possibilities of participants.

4. True learning is always insight or understanding derived from the interpenetration of facts with feelings. (from *Social Education,* 1933, pp. 196-197)

REFERENCES

Anderson, W. (1983). *The upstart spring: Esalen and the American awakening.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Argyris, C. (1982). *Reasoning, learning, and action.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Berger, P. (1974). *Pyramids of sacrifice.* NY: Basic Books.

Bredo, E., & Feinberg, W. (1982). *Knowledge and values in social and educational research.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bunch, C., & Pollack, S. (1983). *Learning our way: Essays in feminist education.* Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.

Butterwick, S. (1987). Learning liberation. In R. Inkster (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Adult Education Research Conference* (pp. 19-24). Laramie, WY: University of Wyoming.

Entwistle, H. (1979). *Antonio Gramsci: Conservative schooling for radical politics.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Fay, B. (1987). *Critical social science.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Freire, P. (1981). *The pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Geuss, R. (1981). *The idea of a critical theory.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Gramsci, A. (1985). The intellectuals. In Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith (Eds. & Trans.) *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* New York: International Publishers.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Lindeman, E. (1933). *Social education.* New York: New Republic.

Mosatche, H. (1983). *Searching: Practices and beliefs of the religious cults and human potential groups.* NY: Stravon Educational Press.

Reed, D. (1981). *Education for building a people's movement.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Rossman, M. (1979). *New age blues: On the politics of consciousness.* New York: E.P. Dutton.

Schniedewind, N. (1983). Feminist values: Guidelines for a teaching methodology in women's studies. In C. Bunch & S. Pollack. (Eds.), *Learning our way: Essays in feminist education.* Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.

Shor, I. (1980). *Critical teaching and everyday life.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987) *A pedagogy for liberation.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Treichler, P. (1986). Teaching feminist theory. In C. Nelson (Ed.), *Theory in the classroom* (pp. 57-129). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

EVA VOM BAUR HANSL: BRAIN-IDEAS VS. LIFE-IDEAS

Bernita A. Bowen

EVA HANSL: A NOT SO ORDINARY WOMAN

There seems to have been little about Eva vom Baur Hansl that was ordinary--except the situation in which she found herself as an educated American woman in the first half of the twentieth century. Born in Harlem in 1889, she was the youngest of six daughters in a middle-class family of German origins. She graduated from Barnard in 1909 and began a career in journalism, writing for the *New York Times, Sun,* and *Tribune.* After graduation from college, she was named a member of the Board of Directors of the Intercollegiate Bureau of Occupations, which some years later merged with the New York State Employment Service (Lobach, n.d.).

Around 1920, Eva married Raleigh Hansl, and had traded a full-time career for motherhood and homemaking by 1924. Perhaps societal restructuring during a time of suffragettes and world war, coupled with a personal restructuring in between college graduation, journalism career, and motherhood brought Eva to a point of conflict. This point represented uncharted territory for other women as well. Her letters, writings, and speeches indicate she found herself caught between the many shifting roles, ideologies, and attitudes of a changing twentieth century.

Eva Hansl's written materials span a period of over fifty years beginning with her 1909 journalism career. Their formats varied from newspaper articles (1911-1916) to speeches, lectures, and seminars given at New York University and Columbia between 1916 and 1939, and for numerous parents' and women's groups over an even larger span of years.

She attempted to educate many types of adults. Her educational writings were not restricted to lectures and speeches; however Hansl frequently wrote magazine articles for *Harper's, Ladies Home Journal,* and *Coronet;* acted as editor for the fledgling *Parents' Magazine;* and published a study for the *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors,* which traced careers and histories of women who dropped out of jobs for a period of homemaking (Hansl, E., & Puffer-Howe, M., 1923). This type of writing spanned a period of years from the early 1920s through 1962. It served to illuminate issues such as women's multiple roles in American society and

the conflicts these roles raised socially and economically. An offshoot issue resulted, regarding the needs throughout society for part-time study for academic credit.

Additionally, Eva Hansl published a book in 1949, *Trends in Part Time Employment of College Trained Women,* which used her vast collection of research for the purpose of suggesting "a campaign for research and action necessary to produce changes in our economy," with part-time employment for educated women seen as the "vocational link between higher education and the family" (Hansl, 1949, p.7). This was the first book written on part-time work in the United States. It not only defined issues for women, and charted possible conflicts or resolutions in diagram-like format, but also viewed such subjects in relation to the larger society. The book enlightens and informs through a balanced blend of theory and data with implications for practice. Hansl ends by calling women to a recognition of issues and solidarity in acting on them. She offers a specific plan for "research, propaganda, and action" on all fronts, using resources at hand, such as husbands, education, local groups, counseling, and job placement opportunities (Hansl, 1949, pp.47-48).

WOMEN'S CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING

In recognizing problems for many women, plus her own situational and attitudinal conflicts, Hansl took the first step in helping others. She has been described as wanting "the best of all worlds for all women" (Lobach n.d., p.7). Whatever had impact on the lives of women interested her, and she energetically acted on that interest. She spent over fifty years researching, writing, and traveling in order to meet what she perceived as a need by educated American women for consciousness-raising and change. Her consequent education of adults was aimed at defining and recognizing these women as a political force, an economic factor, and a unique social group with changing multiple roles.

Her attempts at consciousness-raising and her dialogue for change seem to have been based on two main approaches: research and education, for and about women. Though her primary target was the educated American female, her research and areas of interest were more broadly defined as anything pertinent to the lives of women.

Her method, then, was to explore and disseminate information on all aspects of women's social, political, economic, and cultural interactions in American life. In research, her methodology was affected by her constant collecting of materials relative to women's interests and accomplishments. This research eventually became what is known as the "Perspective on Women in the U.S.A." collection, now housed in the

George Arents Research Library of Syracuse University. This collection not only formed a unique data base from which many women's groups, universities, and government agencies borrowed material, but it also served indirectly to publicize women's issues. Its use, in turn, served to create a broad and efficient network, which one university guidance-head and student personnel-administrator who knew Hansl described as "cross-fertilizing the ideas of many people" (Lloyd-Jones, 1960, p.2).

In education, her methodology was carried out through lectures and speeches, the creation and production of three noted radio series, and the publication of the above-mentioned book, which explored in 1949 the "effect of discontinuity in study and employment" for women who raise families (Lobach, n.d., p.3).

Through her dual methodology Hansl was able to both gather and disseminate information. Until the end of World War II she crossed the country several times for various purposes. She used these opportunities to best advantage by gathering data on women; interviewing educators and labor relations personnel; and visiting war installations in conjunction with her radio script work with the Work Projects Administration, the United States Office of Education, and the War Manpower Commission which sponsored her. Always she was seeking and sharing information on women's issues and interests.

The goals of her methodology were described by Hansl herself as finding a "point of intersection" for educated women's best interests "where her family, her job, and her community all meet" (Hansl, 1949, p.10). Potential critics of her goals or objectives may fail to realize that though her interests covered all women over a wide historical range and in many economies and geographic locales, her main goal seems to have been to choose one small segment--that segment in which she saw herself located--in which to activate change. This is a prudent strategy: It allows for a tighter focus on issues and efficient use of energies, and it suggests a greater potential for success because of the former. It gave Hansl, as activator, the obvious advantages of having a personal stake and an inside view of issues and avenues. In short, she lived the life of the women she wished to study and aid.

ADVOCACY ACTIVITIES

Hansl did live a life that provided a personal stake in various advocacy activities. Specifically, the contextual givens around which she based her activities were the following:

1. In the first half of the twentieth century, educated women in America were facing the modern woman's dilemma. This dilemma was defined as recognition of the fact that women may need to work, and certainly have the right to work, but have difficulty doing this (economically and socially) if they also must maintain the role of homemaker.
2. These women had this need and/or right because work in our society is measured in terms of dollars and cents.
3. There were increasing opportunities for both women's education and employment during this first half of the century, mostly due to milestones such as suffrage and two world wars. Additionally, 1949 saw a period of high peace-time employment with a shortage of technically and professionally trained workers available.
4. Educated American women could be what Hansl described as salvaged from waste to continue to contribute to the larger society and fulfill an obligation to improve the image of and opportunities for all part-time workers (Hansl, 1949, pp. 16-18).

In short, Hansl acted as both prophet and "catalytic agent" in setting and acting on goals (Lloyd-Jones, 1960, p.1). She was prophetic in suggesting that on the changing face of the world it was probable that more and more educated American women, and women in general, would need to work at some point in their lives. Her research suggested economic changes and increased human longevity as causes for this trend (Hansl, 1949).

Hansl saw the value of her own work through its far-reaching potential benefits to the larger society in important social, political, and economic ways. She felt, then, that the study and improvement of the modern woman's lot could be linked to benefits for American society as a whole.

In terms of advocacy for dynamic social change, Hansl may be viewed by today's eyes as fitting under any number of labels. These views intertwine with perceptions of her role as an adult educator. Hansl's interests and activities in contexts of sociology and education can be compared with current views:

> . . . the key words are struggle and shaping. They point to structural issues. Our problems are systemic . . . Each aspect of the social process . . . serves to affect the relationships within and among the others. As a mode of production attempts to reproduce the conditions of its own existence, 'it' creates antagonisms and contradictions in other spheres. As groups of people struggle over issues of gender, race, and class in each of these spheres, the entire social process, including 'the economy,' is also affected. (Apple, 1981, p.27)

Apple goes on to say that these struggles are not mere abstractions or static concepts in some social-process construct, but rather they are real and intrinsic in our daily lives: "People like us live them" (1981, p.27).

Here lies the strength and uniqueness of Eva Hansl as both a strategist or agent-for-change and educator. In a letter to Hansl, a reader of one of her articles, published in Harper's in 1927, offers congratulations. She praises Hansl for not only focusing on issues important to women, but for translating those issues into language that is both clear and connected to the realities of women's daily lives. The letter writer says that Hansl dealt with the facts that "our brain-ideas often have to be overthrown by our life-ideas" and that we all have our "crude anticipations" of the social process, but "Life smashes in!" (MacNeille, 1927, p.3).

Through both her research and her personal involvement in the issues, Hansl gained a unique capacity to work within the system but to struggle with issues and shape some changes. What is both honest and vital about Hansl's struggle and shaping, as educator and agent for change, is the fact that it reflects her own journey through the social process.

Her issue-oriented focus varied somewhat as her own roles and circumstances changed. For example, in 1923 she helped draft a resolution for a convention of the American Association of University Women in Portland, Oregon:

> . . . the avowed purpose of women's education is to help the individual to develop her innate capacities and orient herself in nature . . . develop her mind as an instrument and to equip herself with knowledge . . . (Hansl & Puffer-Howe, 1923, p.1)

Later, she slightly re-shaped her focus to include factors such as motherhood and parenting for women, particularly educated women who may feel even more role conflict.

Her continued journey through the social process, within which she found herself living, created more change, and she further re-shaped her focus in 1927. At this time she participated in producing a report for a study and discussion group comprised of women specialists in sociology, vocations, economics, child welfare, and psychology. The group's focus was on "the total life situation of any mother" whose situation caused her to find herself in "a variety of relationships" with a husband, children, community, work, and her own personhood (*Report on the Discussion Group on Mothers and Time,* 1927).

Twenty years later, her focus changed again to reflect the circumstances of a post-war economy and the dilemma of the woman who wants to or must "keep one hand in [the job market] while she rocks the cradle with the other" (Hansl, 1949, p.27).

Rather than view this focus change as ideological discrepancy or weakness, it may be seen as a strong point in Hansl's perceptual activity. Her flexibility allowed her to adapt both focus and strategy to ever-changing social, political, economic, and cultural contexts of women's issues Though her focus allowed for flexibility, her energies were not scattered--nor were her goals or the methods used to achieve them.

HER DUAL APPROACH

As stated earlier, Hansl's goal was to recognize and define the educated American woman's struggle to find a "point of intersection" in her multiple roles in American society, "to discover her obstacles and how to remove them," and "to suggest a campaign for research and action necessary to produce changes" (Hansl, 1949, p.7).

To achieve these goals, she chose a dual approach: research and education. Specifically, Hansl's dual approach--and her achievements--can be exemplified most clearly by two of her efforts: first, the ongoing collection of materials which she gathered over the years for the "Perspective on Women in the U.S.A." collection. In writing of Hansl's research collection, Lloyd-Jones said this:

> She has maintained files that fairly burst with clippings and reports of all sorts. She has maintained a keen interest in adult education, in the changing patterns of women's lives, in vocational guidance, and deserves a great deal of credit for the role that she has played in stimulating people to work in these fields. (1960, p.2)

The Hansl collection contains a variety of reference material, including personal letters, advertisements, long lists of biographies and reference books about women which Hansl had read and recorded, various brochures, booklets, pamphlets, and advertisements--all pertinent to women in history, politics, the home, and the work force. It is obvious that Hansl's interest was intense. It is also obvious that the value of such a vast and varied collection was not only in serving as a data base for Hansl and the others with whom she shared this information in her lectures and speeches. The collection also served a role in establishing a broad network through which Hansl not only sought information, but shared information, encouraged exploration of ideas and issues, and effectively publicized it all. Another valuable side effect of the research collection was that Hansl used it to create human linkages, to put people in touch with people. In this regard, Lloyd-Jones recounts a story about supervising a doctoral candidate who wanted to work in the field of adult education, particularly with adult women. Lloyd-Jones put the student in touch with Hansl, who put her in touch with a project with the New York State Business and Professional Women's Clubs. Hansl and the student shared collected data, and later Hansl nominated the student for a fellowship grant from the women's clubs (Lloyd-Jones, 1960, p.1).

Hansl herself may have felt that one of the most valuable aspects of her research was that it gave her materials of substance with which to raise the consciousness of women and American society--and with which to educate them. Certainly this value is indicated in what may be considered the highlights of her informative and educational achievements--her written materials and her role in the production of three noted radio series about women.

Between 1939 and 1943 she combined what she had learned through her research, networking, and writing to produce the radio series. Though this achievement covered only about four years of Hansl's lifetime, it represents a monumental effort toward the recognition and definition of American women's roles and abilities. Certainly, viewed within the context of American life at that time, this undertaking must have been both unprecedented and courageous.

The last of the three series, called *Womanpower* and produced between 1942 and 1943, was probably the least educational in the broader contexts of Hansl's usual interests and objectives. For *Womanpower* Hansl was loaned to CBS by the Washington-based War Manpower Commission. Though her actual role with the commission was in its Nutrition Division (another of her interests), Hansl was asked to supervise this production because of her knowledge of journalism, radio, and women's issues. Though the program focused on women, it was limited in its

educational scope, since it was described as "the only official Government program to recruit women" (Lobach, n.d., p.4).

Hansl's two earlier radio series, however, were innovative and broader in educational scope. These series were done in cooperation with the Work Projects Administration and the United States Office of Education. There existed a war-time purpose of showing "the part women have played in the government" and "how women have advanced in government from local to national." But they appear to have been an effective vehicle for consciousness-raising and education as well (Burke, 1940, p.1).

Forty-seven scripts, including background research files for them, were given to Syracuse University and are housed in the George Arents Research Library. Examination of these scripts shows that, though many of the scripts were actually written by Jane Ashman (complete with directions and cues), much of the research, script outlining, interviewing, publicity, and promotion were accomplished by Hansl. Broadcast from May of 1939 through 1940 from Station WJZ and the Blue Network of NBC, the half-hour shows were a platform for recognizing and defining women as a political force, an economic factor, and a unique social group with multiple roles throughout American history.

For the most part, the script formats were roughly the same: (a) a narrated introduction of the particular episode's topic or purpose, (b) a storyline which used actors to reveal past and present attitudes and obstacles surrounding American women, and (c) a speech by or an interview with prominent figures of the day regarding women's interests and abilities. What is extraordinary about the scripts is the breadth of the topics they cover. Included were such topics as "Women as Teachers," "Women in Politics and Government," "Women Through Space and Time," "Women Refugees," "Women and Laws," "Women in Agriculture," "Women and the Press," and "Women The Providers." This last script illustrated the role of Juliet Corson and other American women who studied nutrition for the poor and ways to feed "the working man" to promote good health. "Women as Voters" and "Disabled Women" were the topics of other scripts, as well as "Women in Sports" and "Women in Business," often done with broader categories such as "Freedom of Education" or "Freedom of Speech," reflecting both the times and the shows' sponsors.

The ingeniousness of the series' educational strategies is evident in their structure: they introduced issues, illuminated attitudes, and presented well-known figures who discussed the women's roles and their frequently ignored accomplishments. The first series actually demonstrated Hansl's position, goals, and methodology. It proceeded

as follows: music, narrator announcing show title, and male and female actors opening by talking in a "typical" conversation reflecting attitudes such as the inferiority of women and how women should be allowed no rights in government. The show then proceeded to describe many notable and accomplished women throughout American history, with periodic interjections of other dialogue. The interjections included a depression-era dialogue between husband and wife depicting the wife "going back to work" and the unemployed husband's negative attitude, and a dramatized interview with Amelia Earhart discussing her husband's support of her multiple interests and roles. The show ended in the present, whereupon First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt closed the episode actually speaking from the White House. Most of the remainder of the series' scripts are structurally similar: introduction of issues, exposure of dominant attitudes about women and the obstacles facing them, with support for change or action through linkages to prominent figures or respected authorities at the show's close (Ashman, 1939).

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In viewing Eva vom Baur Hansl's research, writing, and activities, no simple analysis is possible. Her broad view of women's issues and her collection of materials on them are astounding. Her attempts to educate both men and women about women were both energetic and innovative. Her special focus on the category of educated American women, in which she found herself, put her at the forefront of research on, and exploration of, new issues and roles for women in the rapidly changing twentieth century.

Eva Hansl also may be seen as a kind of prophet--not in typically narrow terms as one who predicts the future, although she did accurately predict many trends for women's futures, but in some of the other possible definitions of the word suggested by Ohliger (1987). The simplest and most apt definition of Hansl and her work is that of prophecy in the sense of clearly seeing some essential truth, depending on "choice, action, and human spirit" for its completion--affirmative, and "realistic" (Ohliger, 1987, p.3).

REFERENCES

Apple, M. W. (1981). Reproduction, contestation, and curriculum: An essay in self-criticism. *Interchange, 12* (2-3), pp.48-67.

Ashman, J. (1939). *Women in the making of America.* (Radio show broadcast on NBC and WJZ, New York, May 19). Eva Hansl Collection (Box 14). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library.

Burke, W. S. (1940). [Memo from the U.S. Office of Education on Gallant American Women Series]. Eva Hansl collection (Box 7). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library.

Hansl, E. (1949). *Trends in part time employment of college trained women.* New York: The Woman's Press.

Hansl, E., & Puffer-Howe, M. (1923). [Amendment to resolution for AAUW Convention at Portland, Oregon (Summer)]. Eva Hansl Collection (Box 1). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library.

Lloyd-Jones, E. (1960). [Letter to whom it may concern (June 8)]. Eva Hansl Collection (Box 1). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library.

Lobach, K.S. (n.d.). [*New Yorker* profile suggestion to editor]. Eva Hansl Collection (Box 1). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library.

MacNeille, P.R. (1927). [Letter of congratulations on Harper's article]. Eva Hansl Collection (Box 1). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library.

Ohliger, J. (1987). *If winter comes* (One World of Cultures Series, Wayland House, University of Wisconsin-Madison Campus, February 27). Reprinted in Radical Thinking in Adult Education, an Adult Education Program course offered at Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY.

THE JUST DEMANDS OF THE OTHER: AN INTRODUCTION TO SAMUEL JOSEPH MAY

Irene Baros-Johnson

Increased civic awareness in the mid-nineteenth century was encouraged by the emergence of an informal system of adult education accompanying community development. Greater public participation in literary and verbal information sharing occurred with the proliferation of newspapers and issue-oriented tracts, along with the organization of occasional and periodic meetings to address serious issues. When they invited May to speak, the graduating students of the 1847 class of Harvard Divinity School knew they were to hear from a veteran community educator and radical. Since the 1830s, he had been an activist in abolition and women's rights, as well as in peace issues. During his presentation, however, May did not spend much time advocating any particular cause as right. Instead, he communicated principles for a perspective based on lessons he learned at Harvard decades before as a student (Mumford,1873).

As a divinity student concerned about his sense of doubt, May had gone to Henry Ware, Sr. Rather than being dismissed from the school, May was affirmed for thinking and encouraged always to seek the truth. He stated:

> This conversation not only comforted and strengthened me at the time, but has had an effect upon the conduct and character of my life ever since. I have never been afraid to pursue any inquiry after the truth, however it might seem to endanger long cherished opinions." (Mumford, 1873, p. 48)

This is why at the meeting May encouraged all persons present not only to seek the truth for themselves, but to live up to their idealistic assumption that this was an essential task for others:

> We say it can do a man's mind no good to assert to that as a truth, which he does not perceive to be true; that it can do his heart no good to obey a precept, which he does not from his heart believe to be right. (May, 1847, p. 9)

In addition, May advised the graduates to be open to learning even from the poor and illiterate. From such people, he assured them, they would receive "expositions" (p.9),

which would put to shame their privileged acquisitions of scientific and theological learning.

Rather than creating a simplistic atmosphere of mutually reinforced agreement, May urged a greater sense of responsibility. He stated, "It will be your duty to do all you can to make them think." May urged his audience to encourage the strength and courage of diversity. This, he said, was necessary to foster the practice basic to free will and self-government among all citizens. He set a standard of high expectations:

> Far more to be desired is it that all your hearers should entertain opinions different from your own, because they examine, think, and reason for themselves, than that they should assent to every one of your statements of doctrine, because they are too indolent or too much engaged in business or pleasure to make religion a subject of personal study; or because they are too much afraid of the displeasure of the church or the state, and the reproach of heresy or radicalism, to consider questions of truth and duty with faithful and fearless independence. (p. 10)

Since he had served as the second principal of the first normal school in the United States and on various school boards, May was regarded as an authority in education.[1] Asked to give an address on "The Revival of Education" eight years later in 1855, May again stressed that stimulating people to think is "the first duty" of a teacher in a democracy. He urged that "the teacher should be to his pupils, whatever may be their age, not so much a dictator as a guide," (May, 1855, p. 36) who encourages pupils to observe and to reflect on their observations, since

> we are prepared to accept intelligently and to use wisely the revelations of truth on any subject, that have been made to other minds, only when we have well considered and defined the revelations made to our own minds. (pp. 20-21)

In his 1855 speech May commended the influence of the lyceum lecture series, which became a popular form of adult education. He noted that the lyceums encouraged higher expectations for children's education and enabled diverse members of the adult populace not only to recognize the degree of their ignorance, but to "open their eyes to perceive how frequent the sources of knowledge are, if we know where to look for them; and how accessible, if we approach them in the right direction" (pp. 20-21).

PEACE EDUCATION

Many people in Syracuse, New York, first got to know Samuel Joseph May, their new Unitarian minister, as a peace activist. It was l846 and newspapers were full of items from new front lines of the Mexican War. Groups of young men had become "reinforcements," "companies," or "regiments of infantry." That some would become casualties was hardly mentioned. The work of publicizing, popularizing, and recruiting for the war was in full flood, promoted by speeches by the President of the United States. As a result, there were public meetings in almost every community to support the President's call. There was one in Syracuse on June 4th, 1846. But soon a petition of protest was also placed in the columns of the Syracuse Daily Star:

> The basest principles for the guidance of human conduct are disseminated amongst the people. The pacific precepts and spirit of the Gospel, and the claims of common humanity are derided; and those who dare to urge those precepts, and that spirit upon our countrymen are covered with opprobrious epithets. In a crisis such as this, good men and women may not innocently be silent, or inactive. We call therefore on all, who would stay the tide of war, and avert from our country the terrible evils, which flow from victory as well as defeat--to make their opinions known, and their influence felt.

The petition appeared several times and the list of names signing it grew to 110. The first to sign was Samuel May, its primary author (Petition of protest against the Mexican war, 1846.)

The night of a subsequent protest meeting on June 18, there was an unexpectedly large turnout, since many "Warites" appeared. Their sentiment was expressed in a resolution applauding patriotic conduct and consummate generalship in bloody engagement. As soon as it became clear that the announced agenda was not going to be taken seriously, May advised the friends of the original meeting to gather in another part of the hall. They decided to move to the Congregational Church. May served on the business committee, which drew up resolutions (his usual role at meetings such as this) and made a speech. The meeting went well despite insulting noises and vulgar language which could be heard from a crowd outside. As the peace resolutions were being voted on, a cannon was fired just outside--at least twice--but did not damage the meeting room (*Syracuse Daily Star,* 1846a).

Though the *Syracuse Daily Star* newspaper condemned these violent acts, Sam May wrote a letter to the editor citing inflammatory war language in the newspaper as partly to blame for what happened. He also made use of the opportunity to repeat parts of his speech about class and economic inequalities at work in the war. May shared his thought that there was a class of people in this country, and in every country, ready to foster wars--fought by others--so that they might benefit economically. May also said that when people became aware of how little their feelings, rights, and interests were cared for by those who, "play with their bodies the dread game of battle, I am fully persuaded that the people will refuse to be used, and abused, and used up to gratify the pride, the ambition, the avarice, the revenge of `the few'" (*Syracuse Daily Star,* 1846b).

Members of the Syracuse Unitarian Church that May served were not unprepared for May's stand. In March and April of 1846, May had given a series of evening sermons on specific aspects of a commitment to peace. Then, May noted, "What effect the sermons have had I do not know, but believe they have led many in this community to think and to converse together on the subject" (May, 1846a).

A year before, when May was a candidate to be minister in Syracuse, he also delivered a speech on peace. Many of his activist friends were then recruiting people to sign antislavery peace pledges against the possibility of a war to annex slave-holding Texas. The organizer of the effort, William Lloyd Garrison, editor of the abolitionist paper, *The Liberator,* wrote May a letter from Boston in l845:

> A short time since, I received a Syracuse newspaper . . . complaining of a peace discourse delivered by you, as though it were a very treasonable affair. I read it with a smile to know that you were determined to be faithful . . . All is lost where the truth is surrendered. (Garrison, 1971, p. 303)

May spoke out strongly during his ministerial candidating week on the social issues he cared about. He knew that any church he served needed to know that they were associating themselves with controversial commitments: "I intended they should clearly understand whom they were calling, if they called me" (Mumford, 1873, p. 183). They voted unanimously to issue the call.

For May, peace activism was a family tradition as well as a personal interest. His father, Joseph May, was one of the founding members of the Massachusetts Peace Society. May's father joined this first of American peace organizations because he was influenced by Noah Worchester, a minister who preached a sermon against the

War of l812, wrote a small book called *A Solemn Review of War,* and published a quarterly magazine, *The Friend of Peace* (Cooke, 1902, p. 343-347). As a student, Sam May made an appointment to see Worchester, his mentor-at-a-distance, and they became friends as well as information sharers (Mumford, 1873, p. 48).

May's peace commitment was expressed yet again during commemoration services at the Syracuse City Hall for John Brown in December 1859. Even when war between northern and southern states seemed so near, May asserted and promoted a resolution stating that action to eliminate reasons for conflict was possible (Galpin, 1939, pp. 144-146).

ABOLITION EDUCATION

Known for being a radical who was persistently outspoken in his views, May was also renowned for listening to new viewpoints. In addition, he was skilled in helping others to listen and act in new ways. When he heard William Lloyd Garrison give a speech in 1830, May was deeply affected by a new vision "unstopped by prejudice of color," which could see outrages clearly as wrongs done to our common humanity--to brothers and sisters. May said that Garrison's words gave a new direction to his thoughts and a new purpose to his ministry (Mumford, 1873, p. 141). May adapted his next sermon to let people know they could no longer accept slavery as a given in society. What he said was so shocking to his hearers that they gathered in clusters afterward. The minister informed the visiting May that he would not be invited to preach from that pulpit again. Only one woman came up to him in support, stating,

> Mr. May, I thank you. What a shame it is that I, who have been a constant attendant from my childhood in this or some other Christian Church, am obliged to confess that today, for the first time, I have heard from the pulpit pleas for the oppressed, the enslaved millions in our land." (Mumford, 1873, p. 145).

After that, few ministers dared to exchange pulpits with May. Ralph Waldo Emerson was one of the few to do so. May's philanthropic father and friends told May that he had irreparably harmed his career (Johnson, 1880, p. 90). The American Unitarian Association omitted May's penciled-in additions on slavery when they reprinted the controversial sermon (May, 1830).

May is credited with persuading the most prominent liberal minister of the time, William Ellery Channing, to break his silence about slavery. When Channing

protested that the virulent language used by Garrison was offensive, May answered that the realities being described were more despicable than any language used (May, 1869, pp. 171-175). In speaking out, May became a leading member of a group of radicals who began to advocate the immediate-abolition position first proposed by the British abolitionist Elizabeth Heyrick in 1824. This view was so threatening to the monied order that abolitionists accurately described some of the mobs that attacked them as consisting of well-dressed men of property and standing. May, too, experienced the danger of mobs five times. Securing places that would hold abolition meetings was difficult (Mumford, p. 157).

The right of abolitionist societies to organize and to speak at all was threatened through pressure by southern states. As a result, May spoke to the State Legislature of Massachusetts in 1836, to dissuade them from outlawing abolition societies. He countered criticism of abolitionist materials as incendiary documents meant to stir slave revolts. May said they were directed, on the contrary, to northern audiences. He defended their value, saying that these materials added to the social good by providing accurate information on a matter of prime public concern. May's friend, former President John Quincy Adams, also fought so that abolition petitions not be "gagged" in Congress (J. Pease & W. Pease, 1967b, pp. 14-17).

In the course of the next twelve years, May felt forced to leave two churches because of racial intolerance. He was not the only abolitionist to suffer career setbacks or disruption of a religious community. His friend Lydia Maria Child, who wrote the Thanksgiving season song "Over the River and Through the Woods," suffered several losses after she published one of the first exposes on slavery based on notices common in Southern newspapers. She lost the subscribers of the children's magazine she edited (Anthony, Gage, & Stanton, 1881, p. 480). In addition, she wrote to May that she lost friendships and the library privileges extended to her even though she was a woman (Holland & Meltzer, 1982).

During Prudence Crandall's unpopular attempts to teach in a private school integrated by Sarah Harris and then in a school for Black girls in Canterbury, Connecticut, May often traveled from his home in the next town to support her vision of fully developing every individual's capacities. During this campaign, May followed a pattern he had established in deflecting religious criticism against Unitarians: He used every means of communication then available. It was a pattern he maintained during many other controversies. He wrote letters, appeared at public meetings (or set up alternative ones), wrote newspaper articles and arranged for pamphlet printing (May, 1833). May tried hard to counter fears and frightening rumors about lower property

values, integrated marriages, and threats to social order, with reason and an open minded attitude. He downplayed conflict. After Garrison's castigating headline "HEATHENISM OUTDONE," Prudence Crandall conveyed May's advice "that you and the cause will gain many friends in this town and vicinity if you treat the matter with perfect mildness" (Lutz, 1968, p. 34).

When he was not granted direct access for his point of view in the local public or religious press, May turned to alternatives, such as William Lloyd Garrison's paper, *The Liberator.* May's letter or article would appear, with the additional news that it had been censored. In the case of Prudence Crandall, May found local media unwilling to print his point of view. He attracted a sponsor and recruited an editor to begin publication of an alternative newspaper, *The Unionist* (May, 1869, pp. 61-64).

May's negotiating--rather than adversarial--approach did not relieve the townspeople of responsibility for their actions, however. When a rabble-rousing politician tried to use their acquaintanceship to stop May's involvement, May made the encounter public. When passage of a state law made the school illegal, May helped to make his opponents' strength a weakness. He and all other supporters refused to post bond when Crandall was arrested for violating the state law, though many townspeople asked them to do so. Instead, May whitewashed a cell and had a comfortable bed brought from his house six miles away. The result was an effective media event. The story of incarcerating an idealistic female teacher in a murderer's jail cell made newspaper headlines all over the country (May, 1869, pp. 54-57).

After eighteen months of harassment and isolation, ninety panes of glass in the segregated school were smashed one night. May reluctantly announced that the school would close, "because the house would not be protected by the guardians of the town." He said, "The words blistered my lips, my bosom glowed with indignation. I felt ashamed of Canterbury, ashamed of Connecticut, ashamed of my country, ashamed of my color (May, 1869, p. 71).

Soon after, May left the Brooklyn Church when they forbade antislavery meetings in the building. But these incidents did have a good effect. Reformers who spoke in the area in later years stated that they found more openness there than they found elsewhere (Johnson, 1880, p. 128).

May was a founding member of the American Anti-Slavery Society in Philadelphia and was General Agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society for a year (Mumford, p. 157-162). Then, and on as many other occasions as he could create, he pointed out that acceding to the continuation of slavery blighted the values and lives of the slaveowner, the enslaved, and all bystanders--however distant. Accepting such a

cruel system meant becoming personally responsible for and involved in its present injustice. He also urged change beyond considerations of temporary economic loss and any false vision of gradualism. He said that willing relinquishment of inordinate advantages was necessary (May, 1832) Many of these ideas became the content of a petition against slavery, which appeared in 1845, signed by 170 Unitarian ministers (*New York Tribune,* 1845).

Charles Lenox Remond, a free Black abolitionist, was invited to attend a special event at the church May ministered in South Scituate, Massachusetts in 1842. When Remond arrived, he was surprised to see a large audience listening to children of the parish as they recited antislavery poetry, letters, and speeches. Asked to speak, Remond thanked May and the parents and friends whose encouragement was shown by their presence. In a letter to Garrison, he reported, "I frankly confessed the scene was so new in kind and character in our pro-slavery country that I scarcely knew how to express myself." It was also a dramatic contrast to the absence of such sentiments and action in other public forums:

> And what a burning shame it is, that many of the pieces on the subject of slavery and the slave-trade, contained in different school books, have been lost sight of, or been subject to the pruning knife of the slaveholding expurgatorial system! (Meltzer, 1964, p. 82)

Remond alluded to the increasing lack of traditional Southern sentiments regretting slavery, a point May sometimes made in his speeches (May, 1856). Instead, adamant advocacy of the slavery system was increasing in the face of criticism and political battles (Gillespie, 1972, pp. 78-198). Thus, the abolitionists were maintaining and extending the range of thought available to the public by providing information not easily accessible elsewhere. In addition, by acting together, regardless of race or denomination, in a common cause, the abolitionists modeled a new degree of social respect and cooperation. While May debated the Wesleyan minister Luther Lee in a vigorous series at night, they worked together by day to form a local antislavery chapter. Though their doctrinal theories clashed, their reform interests bound them together in common action (Mumford, 1873, p. 193).

In speaking out, after passage of the Fugitive Slave Law, May stated that he believed in civil disobedience. He referred men and women to a book called *The Higher Law.* May did not see how hypocritically following an unjust law promoted changing the law. Instead, history showed that there was value in some degree of

active dissent. Some committed people should object and refuse to follow an unjust law, so that the rest of the community could be exposed to the choices involved and arrive at a sense of what was, in truth, appropriate:

> What would the effect on the minds of Mr. Webster and others, who have used 'all their personal and official influence' to procure the enactment, and enforce obedience to this Fugitive Slave Law . . . if it should be known, that we, the people of Central New York, who have protested so loudly against it, were nevertheless every where consenting to obey it, in all its provisions? . . . . if we will only become . . . 'the bloodhounds' . . . . They care not how much we bark and howl . . . (May, 1851b)

May trusted that the goodness of people could be cultivated, and that the flexibility in the democratic system led to positive development. The event for which May is most remembered is the Jerry Rescue which took place on October 1st, l851. It was the release of a cooper, who was an escaped slave, by a Syracuse crowd. He had been taken into custody by the authorities to be returned to his owner in accord with the Fugitive Slave Act. May visited him in jail and assured him that he would be rescued (Sperry, 1924, p. 43). When May made a speech after the rescue, he did not mention the hard years of work done by many speakers, like escaped slave Rev. Loguen of the A.M.E. Zion Church, a leader of the underground railroad in Syracuse (Loguen, 1859). Nor did May mention the planning meeting at which it was decided that rescuers would crowd around the police so closely that no violence was possible. The last thing May said as they were leaving was, "If anyone is injured in this fray, I hope it may be one of our party" (May, 1867 p. 377).

Instead, praising the public response which aided the Jerry Rescue, May credited the crowd that gathered in witness to the crisis:

> The citizens of Syracuse and Onondaga County did not, on the 1st of October, violate the law; they set at naught an unrighteous, cruel edict; they trampled upon tyranny . . . when the people saw a man dragged through the streets, chained and held down in a cart . . . only because he had assumed to be what God made him to be, a man and not a slave--when this came to be known throughout the streets, there was a mighty throbbing of the public heart; an all but unanimous uprising against the outrage. There was no concert of action except that to which common humanity impelled the people. Indignation

> flashed from eye to eye . . . Quickened, roused, urged on by this almost universal denunciation of the outrage upon freedom, some men, more ardent, less patient or cautious than the rest, broke through the slight partition between the victim and his liberty; struck off the chains that bound him; and gave him 'a God speed'. . . . If that were sinful, then there were few if any saints in all our town that night. If that were treason, there were few patriots here. (May 1851b)

This is not to claim that public support was unanimous. At least 677 citizens signed the call to a meeting of protest. Opposing newspapers called the incident "the Jerry Riot" (*Bulletin,* 1961, pp. 5-12). But much of the political leadership of the city had announced they would not enforce such a law (Sperry, 1924, p. 19), while Daniel Webster had declared they would be forced to obey (May, 1861, p. 9). Supportive public sentiment proved strong enough to promote dismissal of all trials.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS EDUCATION

May became involved in women's rights through his interest in abolition. After one of his earliest abolition presentations, a woman pointed out parallels in women's subjugation to men (May, 1851a). Women were some of the earliest writers and most active fund-raisers for the abolition movement (J. Pease & W. Pease, 1967a, pp. 174-175). Listing leading figures as mentors for women just becoming active, May noted "They have been traduced, reviled, persecuted, but nothing has deterred them from advocation of the rights of humanity" (Anthony, Gage, & Stanton, 1881, pp. 476-490).

Twenty years earlier however, when Angelina and Sarah Grimke from South Carolina started to speak out in public against slavery, May's prejudices were alarmed. Though he had accepted Quaker minister Lucretia Mott's advice to the founding meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society (*Thirtieth Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society Proceedings,* 1863). May took for granted the Biblical injunction against women speaking out in meetings (I Corinthians, verse 14). Troubled, he went to listen and to see for himself. He approved what the Grimkes said and saw their efforts as useful enough to immediately invite them to speak at the church he served in South Scituate, Massachusetts in 1832 (May, 1867, pp. 233-237). Despite conservative clerical censure of them, May stood by women's rights to speak out and lead meetings. He continued to do so even when some leaders acted on their threats to split the abolition movement over the issue (p. 41). May also asked fellow ministers to invite women speakers (Chadwick, 1899, p. 17).

Twenty years later, in 1852, May again faced the issue of women's right to speak--in the Temperance movement. In Albany, and then in Syracuse, Samuel J. May supported Susan B. Anthony's alternative meeting--though she and Amelia Bloomer were also being criticized in the newspapers for their peculiar manner of dressing in bloomers (Anthony, Gage, & Stanton, 1881, pp. 476-490). As a result, May was castigated and defended in local newspapers for months (*Syracuse Daily Standard,* 1852).

Early in his career in Syracuse, May preached on the need in society for women's full political participation and right to vote, since they were excluded from the process of a state constitutional convention (May, 1853). This was two years before the famous Seneca Falls Women's Rights Convention. For the sermon, which became the first of the women's rights tracts, May used many ideas he gained from Boston Unitarian Lydia Maria Child's *Letters from New York* (1846, p. 245-252). He was also influenced by philosophical writings of Sarah Grimke (1970) other women who were colleagues in activism, and British feminists in this and in many other speeches, articles, and letters on women's rights until he was in his seventies. In articles and at conventions, he became known for advocating "mothers of state" as well as "fathers of state," noting that the nations of the earth and a state or church that excludes women from its councils is like a family without a mother in a condition of "half orphanage." In addition, May used the technique of role reversal to dramatically point out that what seemed so radical was merely a common sense view with many implications:

> Would you have women leave their homes, neglect their children and household duties that they may take part in the management of public affairs? No, nor would I encourage men to do this wrong they often do. The family is the most important institution on earth and never should be neglected for the service of state by male or female. (May, 1846b, p. 10)

The tenor and range of May's support is seen in an interchange of letters sent while arrangements were being made for the Third National Women's Rights Convention, which took place in Syracuse. This letter is dated August 20, 1852:

> Dear Mr. May,
>
> The time for our Woman's Convention is drawing near--you know that we want to make it tell gloriously for the cause of human freedom--and to this end

we want the best helpers, on that occasion. We want Gerrit Smith. This very name & approving presence will do us good. Now will you use your influence to secure his attendance? May be, some members of the Control Committee has written him, but we are so scattered and have so little concert of action that I do not know whether he has been invited. At all events it will be safe for you to ask urge him to be present.

I suppose you will make the notice of the convention spread widely in your vicinity by hand-bills at the time, and by the newspapers before hand--We must cover the expenses by money raised at the convention.

Yours for the Cause,
Lucy Stone (Stone, 1852)

On the back of this letter, May wrote to Gerrit Smith:

Dear Brother,

You will see by the within that there are others besides myself who depend upon your being at the Woman's Rights Convention. I trust you will not fail us. That Convention must be just what it should be. There must be no failure & you will come, you must come prepared to give a noble response in behalf of our sex to the just demands of the other--

I hope the Convention will be duly advertised in the papers of Madison County.

Yours truly,
Samuel J. May

Antoinette Brown is to
preach in my pulpit on the evening
of the 1st Sunday of September. (May, 1852)

It was during this time period that May also appeared at meetings of the New York Teacher's Association to urge that women and blacks be admitted to all departments of education equally.

After the Civil War, when the proposal to enfranchise women at the same time as black men was rejected, May became an organizer for women's suffrage. This was, for him, a third wave of women's rights activism.

Writing a letter to the convention of a new women's rights organization, May reported that a series of talks in Syracuse indicated a revival of interest in the subject. Concretely, within three weeks after Lucy Stone spoke on "Women's Rights," a petition for the enfranchisement of women was sent to Congress. It was signed by over 1,700 adult residents of the city. Then at ten weekly meetings at the City Hall, "the subject was publicly discussed with earnestness by speakers on both sides, before always large and sometimes crowded audiences." He planned to organize another series on the subject for the fall and invited Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucy Stone to participate in evening meetings. He stated, "We will promise them two or three able, gentlemanly opponents who are sincere in thinking our doctrines erroneous--and who will give them an opportunity fully to vindicate those doctrines in every particular (May, 1869).

In advocating women's rights, May again encouraged strong advocacy of an unpopular point of view, but created opportunities for the moderating effects of public debate. As he had in the education, peace, and abolition movements, May modeled and promoted a new vision of a democratic citizen. In displaying the new reality of men seriously listening to the public proclamations and acting upon the ideas of women, May pioneered new societal attitudes which were often reported on by the press. Not only unpatronizingly receptive to suffragists' ideas and a public advocate of them, May was willing to change his accustomed patterns of behavior. Unlike most other men, he was willing to credit women for major ideas and to accept public correction by women of him. He was also willing to share leadership with them--in what he called the most radical movement of all (*Proceedings of the Women's Rights Convention*, 1852).

CONCLUSION

Promoting democratic ideals in the mid-nineteenth century prompted May to engage in educational efforts among adults designed to encourage more inclusive attitudes and to increase democratic participation. In the peace, abolition, and women's rights movements, May became an influential figure who was attentive to underclass insights and was affected by radical ideas. Despite the costs of advocating unpopular ideas, May publicly affirmed the new principles he accepted. May also

extended speaking and publicizing opportunities to fellow radicals to encourage expanded public consciousness. Thus, he fostered new social debate and provided an authoritative voice on the need for changes that encouraged greater justice, public participation, and self-fulfillment. He acted on behalf of the lower classes by peace activism, of black Americans by abolition activism, and of women by suffrage activism. It is significant that as his activism in each movement progressed, he also advocated the need for increased public forums and educational structures to sustain opportunities for each group. May's importance is that he led a critical and committed life, "accepting both the power and peril of discourse, engaging in a battle for truth with a conscious preference for the oppressed (cited in Weeler, 1986).

NOTES

[1] May was a winter teacher while in college and seminary (Mumford, 1873, pp. 48-9). In his first parish, he served on the school committee and instituted local and statewide reforms to upgrade the educational level of teachers (pp. 86-87, 118-121). At the suggestion of Mr. Horace Mann, he also served as the principal of the Lexington Normal School for two years (pp. 171-182). May gave many addresses throughout his career. For example, in the 1850s, May appeared with Susan B. Anthony at several meetings of the New York State Teacher's Association, to urge for schools integrated in all departments by women and black students. In the1860s, May served as President of the Board of Education of Syracuse, New York. His advocacy led to the vote to abolish corporal punishment in the city's schools.

REFERENCES

[Analysis of the Rev. Mr. Ashley's discourse, titled "The Christian's duty towards the propagators of error]. (1852, November 23). *Syracuse Daily Standard.*

Anthony, S., Gage, M. J., & Stanton, E. C. (1881). *History of woman suffrage* (Vol. I). New York: Fowler & Wells.

Bulletin of the Onondaga Historical Association. (1961, October). Syracuse, NY.

Chadwick, J. W. (Ed.). (1899). *A life for liberty: Anti-Slavery & other letters of Sallie Holley.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Child, L. M. (1846). *Letters from New York, XXXIV.* New York: C.S. Francis & Co.

Cooke, G. W. (1902). *Unitarianism in America.* Boston: American Unitarian Association.

Galpin, W. F. (1939, September 29).*Samuel Joseph May: God's core boy.* New York State Historical Association.

Garrison, W. L. (1971). *Letters of William Lloyd Garrison* (Vol. 3). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gillespie, N. C. (1972). *The collapse of orthodoxy: The intellectual ordeal of George Frederick Holmes.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Grimke, S. M. (1970) *Letters on the equality of the sexes and the condition of woman* (reprint). New York: Burt Franklin.

Heyrick, E. (1824). *Immediate, not gradual abolition.* London: Knight & Bagster.

Holland, P., & Meltzer, M. (1982). *Lydia Maria Child: Selected letters, 1817-1880.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Johnson, O. (1880). *William Lloyd Garrison and his times.* Boston: B.B. Russell.

Loguen, J. W. (1859). *The Rev. J.W. Loguen, as a slave and as a freeman.* Syracuse, NY: J.G.K. Truair & Co.

Lutz, A. (1968). *Crusade for freedom: Women of the antislavery movement.* Boston: Beacon Press.

May, S. J. (1830). *On prejudice.* Boston: The American Unitarian Association.

May, S. J. (1832). *A discourse on slavery in the United States* (delivered in Brooklyn, Connecticut, July 3,1831). Boston: Garrison & Knapp.

May, S. J. (1833). *The right of colored people to education, vindicated: Letter to Andrew T. Judson, Esq. and others in Canterbury, remonstrating with them on their unjust and unjustifiable procedure relative to Miss Prudence Crandall and her school for colored females.* Brooklyn, CT: Advertiser Press.

May, S. J. (1846a, April 12). *Church Recordbook* (May Memorial Unitarian Society, Syracuse, NY).

May, S. J. (1846b, November). *The enfranchisement of women, the rights and conditions of women considered.* (Sermon preached in Syracuse.) Syracuse, NY: Stoddard & Babcock.

May, S. J. (1847, July 11). *Jesus the best teacher of His religion: A discourse delivered before the graduating class of the Cambridge Theological School.* Boston: Wm. Crosby & H.P. Nichols.

May, S. J. (1851a). [October 23, 1850 Letter to Women's Rights Convention, Worcester, Massachusetts]. *In Proceedings of the Women's Rights Convention.* Boston: Prentiss & Sawyer.

May, S. J. (1851b). *Speech of the Rev. Samuel J. May to the convention of citizens of Onondaga County, in Syracuse, on the 14th of October, 1851.* Syracuse, NY: Agan & Summers, Standard Office.

May, S. J. (1852, August 25). [Letter to Gerritt Smith]. Gerritt Smith Collection. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library.

May, S. J. (1855). *The revival of education: An address to the Normal Association, Bridgewater, Massachusetts, August 8, 1855.* Syracuse, NY: J.G.K. Truair.

May, S. J. (1856). *Liberty or slavery the only question: Oration delivered on the fourth of July, 1856 at Jamestown, New York.* Syracuse: Daily Journal Office.

May, S. J. (1861). *The Fugitive Slave Law and its victims* (rev. ed.). New York: American Anti-Slavery Society.

May, S. J. (1869, May 11). Letter to the president, secretary, and members of the American Equal Rights Association. In S. Anthony (Ed.) *The Revolution.* New York.

May, S. J. (1869). *Some recollections of our antislavery conflict.* Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co.

Meltzer, M. (1964). *In their own words* (a history of the American Negro, 1619-1865). New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Mumford, T. J. (1873). *Life of Samuel J. May.* Boston: Roberts Brothers.

Pease, J. H., & Pease, W. H. (1967a). *The role of women in the anti-slavery movement.* The Canadian Historical Association.

Pease, W. H., & Pease, J. H., (1967b, Autumn). Samuel J. May: Civil libertarian. *Cornell Library Journal,* 14-17.

[Petition of protest against the Mexican War]. (1846, June 17 &18). *Syracuse Daily Star.*

Proceedings of the Women's Rights Convention. (1852). Syracuse, NY: J.E. Masters.

[Protest against American slavery by one hundred and seventy Unitarian ministers]. (1845, October 7). *New York Tribune.*

Sperry, E. E. (1924). *The Jerry rescue.* Syracuse, NY: Onondaga Historical Association.

Stone, L. (1852). [Letter to Samuel J. May]. Gerritt Smith Collection. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library.

Syracuse Daily Star. (1846a, June 19).

Syracuse Daily Star. (1846b, June 24).

Thirtieth anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society Proceedings. (1863).

Weeler, K. (1986). [Review of *Communities of resistance and solidarity: A feminist theology*]. *Journal of Education, 168* (2), 144.